FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-197
Friday
3 October 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-197 *13 October 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

General Markelov Interviewed on Asian Troop Cuts *[Moscow International]* 1
Statistics Reported on Arms, Troop Cuts *[Shakov on Moscow International]* 1
Karpov Addresses Forum, Views Arms Talks Progress *[TASS]* 2
Claims of Genetic Weapons Program Refuted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Oct]* 2
Petrov Interviewed on Chemical Weapons *[Zagreb DANAS 3 Oct]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Gerasimov News Briefing 12 Oct 8
Missile Attack on Kabul 8
Mideast, Mubarak Visit, Finland's Valtanen 8
Gerasimov Cited on Poland at Pact Committee Session *[Warsaw PAP]* 8
United Nations Forum Continues, Lukyanov Speaks *[PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 8
Nuclear Power Spokesman Cited at IAEA Session *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 10
Petrovskiy 'Satisfied' With United Nations Debate *[TASS]* 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

CIA, KGB Retirees Discuss Antiterrorism Fight *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Oct]* 13
San Diego 'People's Diplomacy' Forum Reported *[PRAVDA 8 Oct]* 13
TASS on U.S. Conference on Soviet Developments 14

China

Special Events in Moscow Mark PRC National Day 14
Soviet Scholars Hold Enlarged Session *[Moscow International]* 14
Meeting at Trade Union Building *[Moscow International]* 14
Friendship Society Lecture Meeting *[Moscow International]* 15
USSR-PRC Cooperation Viewed on National Day *[Moscow International]* 15
PRC National Day, Normalization of Ties Discussed *[Nikolayev on Moscow International]* ... 16
Anniversary of USSR-PRC Diplomatic Ties Noted 16
Yu Marks Anniversary of Relations *[Moscow International]* 16
Officials Gather at 5 Oct Soiree *[Moscow International]* 17
Establishment of PRC-USSR Ties Hailed *[(Karavayev) on Moscow International]* 17
Soviet, Chinese Friendship Groups Sign Agreement *[Moscow International]* 18
Commentary on Foreign Policies of USSR, PRC *[Volskiy on Moscow International]* 19
PRC's Crises, Problems 'Now Being Resolved' *[Moscow Radio]* 19
China's Chemical Weapons Stance Viewed Favorably *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* .. 19
Moscow TV Notes Worsening Drug Problem in PRC 20
Lao-Chinese Statement on Normalization Issued *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 20
Normalization of Relations Viewed *[Melnichenko on Moscow International]* 20

Northeast Asia

DPRK Issues Appeal to S. Koreans on Unification *[IZVESTIYA 8 Oct]* 21
USSR-DPRK Joint Programs, Enterprises Cited *[Moscow International]* 21
Fur, Leather Joint Venture Set Up *[TASS]* 22
DPRK Premier Thanks Ryzhkov for Congratulations *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* 22

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Defense Minister Cited on Situation *[PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 22
Cambodian Denial of SRV Troops' Capture Cited *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* 23
Commentary Discusses 'Fresh Violence' in Cambodia *[Trushin on Moscow International]* 23
Petrovskiy Meets With SRV Counterpart in New York *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 23
Vietnamese Delegation Studies Work of CPSU *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 23

Near East & South Asia

Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Algeria 24
Pallayev, Delegation Arrive *[TASS]* 24
Meets President, Parliamentarians *[IZVESTIYA 9 Oct]* 24
Discussions With Officials Summarized *[IZVESTIYA 11 Oct]* 24
Delegation Ends Visit 9 Oct *[Moscow Radio]* 26
Current State of Mideast Diplomacy Described *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 26

Sub-Saharan Africa

U.S. Attitude Toward Angola Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 12 Oct]* 27
Somalia's 'Economic Difficulties' Assessed *[Mikhaylov on Moscow International]* 28
Commentary on Drought in Northern Ethiopia *[Borisov on Moscow International]* 29

East Europe

Polish Request for Katyn Investigation Noted *[Moscow International]* 29
Further Reportage on Visit by Poland's Rakowski 30
Report on Address to Newsmen *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 30
Interview on Relations *[Moscow International]* 30
Hager Visits Moscow; Remarks on GDR Issues 31
Says 'No Divisions' in Leadership *[Hamburg DPA]* 31
Comments on Future of Socialism *[TASS]* 31
Hungary Condemns 1968 Move Into CSSR *[IZVESTIYA 30 Sep]* 32
Reportage on New Hungarian Party's Congress 32
'Heated Debates' Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Oct]* 32
Congress Ends 10 Oct *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 33
Congress Not 'Purely Cosmetic' *[IZVESTIYA 11 Oct]* 33
Nyers on Distinctions Between Old, New Party *[PRAVDA 13 Oct]* 34
Hungarian Party Metamorphosis Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 35
Differences Within MSZMP Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Oct]* 36
CPSU Legal Policy Commission Visits Bulgaria *[PRAVDA 8 Oct]* 38
Rogachev, Bulgarian Aide Discuss Asia-Pacific *[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]* 38

West Europe

Gorbachev To Visit Finland 25-27 Oct *[TASS]* 38
Thatcher on Gorbachev's Leadership Qualities *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 38
Yakovlev Receives UK Communist Party Leader *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 38
Brutents Heads CPSU Visit to Ireland *[PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 39
Ryzhkov Receives Netherlands Delegation *[PRAVDA 13 Oct]* 39
USSR-Netherlands Cooperation Agreement Signed *[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]* 39
Belgian King Greeted on National Day *[IZVESTIYA 11 Oct]* 39

Latin America & America

Shevardnadze, Castro Note 'Successful' Relations *[TASS]* 39

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Plan Commission Discussions Cited *[IZVESTIYA 30 Sep]* 41
Privileges Commission Discussions Reported *[IZVESTIYA 30 Sep]* 42
USSR Compliance With CSCE Norms Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 10 Oct]* 43
Committee Discussion on Land Use Described *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Oct]* 44
Price Expert Comments on Abalkin Speech *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Oct]* 47
Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet 11 Oct 48
Economic Reform Committee on 1990 Plan *[TASS]* 48
Medvedev, Others Take Part in 'Party Building' *[Moscow radio]* 49
Election Process Viewed *[TASS]* 49
Committees, Commissions Meet 12 Oct 50
Defense 'Conversion' Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Draft Language, Property Laws Discussed *[TASS]* 50
Supreme Soviet 'Emotional' Debate Noted *[IZVESTIYA 12 Oct]* 51
Supreme Soviet News Conference on Railways *[TASS]* 53
New Journal NARODNYY DEPUTAT Profiled *[IZVESTIYA 3 Oct]* 53

Political & Social

Monitoring of NKAO Blockade Situation Continues 54
More Trains Arrive From Azerbaijan *[Moscow International]* 54
Rail Traffic 'Completely Restored' *[TASS]* 54
Yerevan Argues Blockade Continues *[Yerevan International]* 54
Women, Children Put on Tracks *[Yerevan Radio]* 55
Two Soldiers Arrested *[Yerevan Radio]* 55
Konarev Speculates on Use of Force *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Oct]* 56
NKAO Official Calls for Plebiscite *[Yerevan International]* 56
NKAO Congress Appeals to Azerbaijan *[Yerevan International]* 57
"Vremya" Reporting Termed 'False' *[Yerevan International]* 57
TASS Report Data Criticized *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 30 Sep]* 58
'No Improvement' in Crime Situation *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 58
Yerevan Party Official on Effects *[Moscow Radio]* 59
Armenian NKAO Official on Blockade *[ARMENPRES]* 59
Emergency Measures Called for *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Oct]* 59
Voskanyan Criticizes Central Authorities *[ARMENPRES]* 61
New NKAO-Armenia Air Link Opened *[ARMENPRES]* 62
Medics Issue Appeal on Armenian Quake Victims *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 62
Demonstrations Protest Armenians in USSR Army *[Yerevan International]* 63
Deputies Discuss New Constitutional Provisions *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 63
Alekseyev Comments on Party's Role *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 7 Oct]* 63
Akhromeyev Denies 'Collusion' With U.S. on Baltics *[TASS]* 64
Roundtable on Lithuanian Communist Party Held *[Vilnius Radio]* 64
Vilnius Art Gallery, Court Declare Strikes *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 66
Latvian Popular Front Official Interviewed *[Vilnius International]* 66
Liepaja Delegate Addresses Latvian People's Front *[Riga Radio]* 67
Nationalities Plenum, Party in Perestroyka Viewed
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 4 Oct] 67
Ban on Ukrainian Nationalists Urged *[PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 69
Minister on Meeting Miners' Demands *[TRUD 1 Oct]* 72
KGB's Kryuchkov L'UNITA Interview Cited *[KOMOSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Aug]* 75
Union of Soviet Managers Founded; Head Appointed *[TASS]* 79
RSFSR Trade Union Congress Set for March 1990 *[TASS]* 79
Union Writers 'Outraged' by 'Insult' to Russians *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Oct]* 79
Vlasov Addresses RSFSR Council Session *[Moscow Radio]* 80
RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Formed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Oct]* 80
Republics Urged to Protect Minority Rights *[IZVESTIYA 6 Sep]* 80
Odessa Military District Political Work Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Oct]* 83
Non-Native Migration From Tajikistan Reported *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 22 Sep]* 85

Foreign Broadcast Chief Speaks on Perestroyka *[Moscow International]* 85
Nationality Writings From PRAVDA Collected *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* 85
New Goskompriroda Chairman Vorontsov Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 2 Sep]* 85
Public's Concerns Over Tatar AES Project Outlined *[PRAVDA 5 Oct]* 91
Medvedev on Gdlyan Commission's Problems *[IZVESTIYA 29 Sep]* 91
Interior Ministry Briefing on Crime Rates *[TASS]* 93
MVD Internal Troops Chief Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Oct]* 94
RSFSR Red Cross Opens Moscow Soup Kitchen *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 95
New Business Paper Published in USSR *[Moscow TV]* 95

Military

Akhromeyev Discussses Military Issues *[Moscow TV]* 95
Correction to Akhromeyev on Military Issues 105
Yazov Addresses Army Ideological Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 106

General Markelov Interviewed on Asian Troop Cuts

LD1210135689 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 12 Oct 89

[From the "Focus on Asia and the Pacific" program]

[Excerpts] Speaking at the United Nations last December, Mikhail Gorbachev announced a decision to cut the Soviet armed forces unilaterally by half a million men and to substantially reduce conventional armaments in 1989 and 1990. Our reporter has asked the head of the press center of General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, Major General (Yuriy Markelov), to highlight the measures in keeping with this big initiative concerning the Asian part of this country. We now present the English transcript of this interview.

[Reporter] What can you say about reductions of the Soviet troops in the east?

[(Markelov)] By 1 January 1991 the number of these troops will drop by 200,000 men. So far, the boards of the Central Asian and Urals Military Districts have already been abolished. The boards of another four armies and three army corps in the Asian part of the USSR are also to be disbanded. As a result of better relations between the USSR and China, the process has already started of reducing and reorganizing Soviet troops deployed along the Soviet- Chinese frontier. They will have a strictly defensive structure.

[Reporter] It is known that the normalization of relations with China you have mentioned has also affected the presence of Soviet troops in Mongolia. What is the state of affairs there?

[(Markelov)] Within the unilateral reduction of the Soviet armed forces, troops are being pulled out that were temporarily employed in the Mongolian People's Republic. Already withdrawn from it by now are one former division, three antiaircraft brigades, and an Air Force division, which has been disbanded. All in all the pullout covers nearly 23,000 servicemen, 404 tanks, 307 field guns and 41 combat aircraft. By January 1991, 75 percent of ground troops of the entire Air Force grouping will have been withdrawn from Mongolia. That totals five divisions, including two armor divisions, one motorized infantry division and two air force divisions as well as several separate regiments. This force totals 50,000 men, more than 850 tanks, some 1,100 armored personnel carriers, 820 different artillery pieces, some 190 aircraft and 130 helicopters.

[Reporter] What can you say about the Soviet troops stationed directly in the Far East?

[(Markelov)] This year and next, the grouping of the Soviet troops in the Far East will have been reduced by 120,000 men. This covers 12 infantry divisions and 11 Air Force regiments. Sixteen combat ships will have been withdrawn from the Soviet Pacific Fleet. The remaining troops will have missions of defense. [passage omitted]

The United States and Japan have more than a double superiority in personnel; four times more surface naval ships of the main classes; and a total superiority in surface ships equipped with cruise missiles. There is also double the Soviet number of strike aircraft. The fact that the USSR in its turn has a superiority in tanks, armoured personnel carriers and artillery does not play a decisive role. The supremacy in ground forces from the graphic and strategic angle can only partly compensate for the above-mentioned superiority of the armed forces of the United States and Japan. Thus, speaking about a military threat in the Asian and Pacific region, one can see it doesn't come from the Soviet Union.

Statistics Reported on Arms, Troop Cuts

OW1310055989 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Shakov commentary]

[Text] According to a Moscow announcement, the Soviet Union completed its plan to withdraw troops from member states of the Warsaw Pact and Mongolia for this year. The number of Soviet troops stationed in its European allies and Mongolia was reduced by more than 50,000 as a result. More than 3,000 tanks, 760 artillery pieces, and over 350 aircraft were pulled out. Station commentator Shakov writes in this connection:

This proves once again that the Soviet leader matches his deeds with his words. Soviet leader Gorbachev explained the Soviet Union's overall plan to reduce its troops in Europe and Asia at last year's UN General Assembly. He then said: The Soviet Union will withdraw 500,000 troops from those countries in the next 2 years. The Soviet Union will reduce its troops in the Asian part of the Soviet Union and Mongolia by 200,000 by 1 January 1991, 120,000 of which will be decreased from the troops stationed in the Soviet Far East.

The commander of the Soviet troops stationed in Mongolia said: So far one tank division, three Air Defense brigades, and one Air Force division have been withdrawn from Mongolia, including more than 23,000 troops, 400 tanks, 300 artillery pieces, and 41 fighter planes.

The Soviet troops stationed in the Soviet Far East will be reduced by 12 divisions. [Words indistinct] Then, what response has the United States made at the frontline? Regrettably, the Soviet plan to withdraw troops from Europe and Asia and to reduce its armaments have not received support and understanding from the Washington ruling clique [tongzhi jituan]. It has tried by hook or by crook to maintain its armed forces in Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines.

The Soviet Union has shown other countries that it has been following a completely different path. The Soviet Union has been implementing the plan for peaceful mediation and the reduction of military facilities in Asia as expounded by Gorbachev in his Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk speeches. The Soviet Union is, of course,

concerned about its own security, but this is to be done by using political means to create a favorable climate in which hostility, misgivings, and distrust can be dispelled; not through an arms race.

Gorbachev's words have become reality—Soviet troops in Europe and Asia have been greatly reduced a year after his speech at the UN General Assembly. We hope very much that other countries, including the Soviet Union's neighboring countries and Asian countries, will contribute to improving the political climate of the Asia-Pacific region.

Karpov Addresses Forum, Views Arms Talks Progress

LD1210140289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1300 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 12 Oct (TASS)—"The accords reached in the course of the recent meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze and James Baker have raised Soviet-U.S. relations to a qualitatively new level," stated Viktor Karpov, USSR deputy foreign minister and head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Problems of Arms Control and Disarmament Administration.

Speaking to participants in the seventh Soviet-U.S. meeting of jurists and experts on problems of arms control and disarmament, which is being held here, the Soviet diplomat stressed that compromise solutions were found in Wyoming on many fundamental issues on which the further development of Soviet-U.S. dialogue depended: Progress had been achieved on the question of banning chemical weapons, differences had been overcome on the problem of monitoring nuclear tests, and good conditions had been created for successful completion of the Vienna talks on reduction of conventional forces and armaments in Europe.

Viktor Karpov particularly singled out the question of strategic offensive weapons. "In Wyoming," he recalled, "the Soviet Union lifted the demand not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty in the course of the term agreed on, and expressed its readiness to sign agreements on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons, even if the ABM problem had not been solved by that time. This approach provides a good basis for signing the agreement on strateic offensive weapons in the near future.

"Nevertheless," Viktor Karpov stressed, "we still believe that there exists a direct link between strategic offensive weapons and the ABM Treaty, and so each side must have the right to withdraw from the treaty on strategic offensive weapons in the event of its being violated."

Concerning points in dispute, Viktor Karpov particulary mentioned the issue of air-based cruise missiles. "We do not agree with the method proposed by the Americans for counting cruise missiles on bombers. In our view, one should reckon on the maximum number of cruise missiles an aircraft can carry. For instance, for the U.S. B-52 bomber, this number is equal to 12 air-based cruise missiles. The Americans, however, propose limiting themselves to the figure 10. This places us in an unequal position, since the majority of Soviet bombers are equipped for only six cruise missiles.

"However," Viktor Karpov noted in conclusion, "we do not believe that the outstanding problems are unsolvable. Both sides seriously want to reach agreement on strategic offensive weapons, and I think that the remaining differences will be overcome.

Claims of Genetic Weapons Program Refuted

PM1210114789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with Lieutenant General S.V. Petrov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Chemical Troops, and Professor N.B. Yevstafyev, "leading specialist in the chemical weapons field," by TASS political observer Sergey Kulik: "Story in the 'Cold War' Spirit as Told by Mr Adams of THE SUNDAY TIMES. Chopping Down a Tree With a Spade"; date and place of interview not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Following the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and U.S. foreign policy departments in Wyoming there was an obvious rapprochement in the two powers' positions on questions of chemical disarmament. The prospect of the global banning and elimination of chemical weapons is becoming a real one. All the same, despite palpable progress in this sphere, the Western mass media periodically palm off improbable stories on their readers about the chemical weapons of the future. Lengthy articles are appearing citing foreign special service data, which refer to the creation of the "latest variety" of these weapons in the USSR—genetic weapons. TASS political observer Sergey Kulik talked to Lieutenant General S.V. Petrov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Chemical Troops, and Professor I. Yevstafyev, a leading specialist in the field of chemical weapons, about the reasons for the appearance of such articles and their slant. The material has been prepared especially for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

[Petrov] I would say that a definite pattern can be glimpsed in the appearance of such articles. They are usually timed to coincide with various real steps at the talks to ban chemical weapons. As a rule, the aim of these articles is to cast a slur on the sincerity of the Soviet Union's intentions.

[Yevstafyev] A lengthy article published in London's THE SUNDAY TIMES was the latest example of this. Its defense correspondent James Adams took up his pen with a view to deadening the positive response to the Soviet Union's initiatives at the current UN General Assembly session and the Soviet-U.S. accords in this sphere secured at the meeting between E.A. Shevardnadze and J. Baker in Wyoming. The article with its biased slant is intended for the inexperienced and therefore gullible reader.

[Kulik] J. Adams urges the reader to draw the following conclusion: "Don't trust the Soviet Union." The "logic"

of the article is that the Russians are allegedly only proposing to completely do away with existing chemical weapons because they have mastered the secret of producing an even more dreadful means of mass destruction which can supposedly "play a crucial role in a war."

[Yevstafyev] I cannot describe myself as far-removed from the topic under discussion. It was especially interesting for me to learn in which direction, according to "Western intelligence," our scientific and strategic thought is operating. It transpires that a new type of Soviet "genetic" weapon, the British newspaper claims, "has been obtained by means of genetic engineering and represents a giant step forward from the viewpoint of its specific effect on people." What kind of "effect" is this? J. Adams "knows for certain" that a chemical agent, which poses a threat to the world, "induces uncontrollable diarrhea in tank crews, preventing them from carrying out combat operations." While infantrymen (note the chemical agent's selective action—by branch of troops) "may succumb to irrepressible hysteria, resulting in tears which prevent them from firing their weapons and carrying out orders."

[Kulik] You may laugh, but I don't envy, for instance, Danish readers of THE SUNDAY TIMES, who read the following in this newspaper: "Soviet special forces release bombs carrying gas on three Danish cities. They cause such severe vomiting and diarrhea that normal life in the country is completely disrupted. The government in Copenhagen is warned that other gas canisters will also be detonated and the population infected with lethal nerve agents for which there is no antidote." The English themselves, whom J. Adams alarmed in this article with the prospect of a chemical cruise missile strike on Britain's seven main power stations, were probably not feeling quite themselves either.

[Yevstafyev] Let me reveal what was previously—until the period of glasnost—a well-kept secret: These "perfidious Russians" developed and tested dreadful genetic weapons that induce diarrhea and vomiting during World War I when even the very term "genome" did not yet exist, rather than over the last few years, as J. Adams believes. An eyewitness whose objectivity can be totally trusted has cited a description of the results of these tests. I am of course referring to Jaroslav Hasek's "The Good Soldier Schweik." Do you recall? "During the fighting several people soiled their trousers. An injured man recently told us in Budejovice that he soiled his pants three times in succession. First, when they crawled out of the shelter onto the area in front of the barbed wire fence; second when they began to cut the wire; and third when the Russians attacked them with bayonets and began to yell 'hurrah.' They returned to the shelter then but there was not a single man in the entire company who had not soiled his pants." THE SUNDAY TIMES With its "acute diarrhea" among NATO tank crews spied through the view port can by no means compete with this description for color!

[Kulik] I am by no means in favor of conducting dialogue with colleagues on the basis of the principle "looking for scapegoats...." However, J. Adams' reference to "similar preparations" of genetic weapons in the West illustrates that they are nothing new for NATO. This conclusion is also backed up by a report in his article on the showing of a film about the use of genetic engineering in military production at the Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Warfare School at Winterborne. Strange changes take place before the viewers' eyes under the influence of drugs prepared using genetic engineering: A terrified cat retreats into a corner away from an advancing mouse. Then a platoon of U.S soldiers appears on the screen, undergoing training in field conditions. "Owing to the stupefying effect of the chemical agents they swiftly become undisciplined," THE SUNDAY TIMES reports. "Half the soldiers become very lethargic while the others become hyperactive and some try to chop down a tree with a spade."

Last, another admission: "Britain's Ministry of Defense Chemical Defense Establishment at Porton Down is urgently working on new equipment and antidotes to neutralize the effect of the new poisons." Soviet poisons?

[Petrov] Not necessarily! For, as is well known, you also put on a gas mask to guard yourself against your own gas attacks on the enemy....

The Western press has featured several reports about the use of genetic engineering in resolving the problem of biological synthesis of toxins and the creation of substances whose effectiveness far exceeds existing types of chemical weapons using these methods. There are, evidently, circles in the Western military-industrial complex interested in continuing this research and hoping to obtain fresh millions for it with the aid of conjecture about Soviet genetic weapons. On the whole it seems that J. Adams—or, more correctly, the representatives of the NATO "old guard" guiding his hand, who are incapable of new thought—has decided to make the Geneva talks one of the main targets of his attacks. The representatives of 40 states are involved in elaborating an all-embracing treaty on the complete banning of chemical weapons there. "The appearance of genetic weapons casts a shadow over these talks. Can we verify the production and destruction of this kind of weapon," THE SUNDAY TIMES observer asks, and then also casts doubt on the entire complex of proposals aimed at ensuring the universal destruction of chemical weapons and verification of this process.

[Yevstafyev] Of course, one should not be as categorical as the British journalist. However, I can understand J. Adams' concern over the problem of exercising effective international verification in this sphere. Can we achieve not only the guaranteed destruction of the former chemical weapons stocks from World War I and World War II and the destruction of these weapons' production base, but also effective verification that the chemical weapons of the

future—be they traditional binary weapons or exotic genetically-engineered chemical weapons—are not being developed? A positive response to this question is very important. When formulating the sections of a future convention on banning the development of chemical weapons we must approach very attentively the elaboration of a mechanism that would definitely rule out the emergence of futuristic chemical weapons in scientists' laboratories to replace the stocks that have been destroyed.

[Kulik] What do people in the West understand by genetic weapons—real not imaginary?

[Yevstafyev] By Western specialists' definition, genetic weapons include chemical agents—mutagens—which, following their transfer to combat status, can affect an organism's genetic material. This results in the appearance in the organism of new signs or the disappearance of some existing ones. When generative cells are affected, the effect of the mutagens will be manifest in subsequent generations. At the same time genetic anomalies in the somatic cells may cause the appearance of malignant neoplasms, heightened susceptibility to various illnesses, and malfunctioning the nervous system in the living organism in question.

In 1987 Italy's L'UNITA, for instance, assessed as science fiction the possibility of creating substances by genetic engineering whose influence would cause the organism to stop assimilating, say, bread or milk.

Extensive studies of an organism's genome as a whole and individual genes and chromosomes are being carried out in many countries. These studies are designed to benefit man and mankind. There is no need to strive to specially extract some militarist slant from them. Can they be used for military purposes? Yes, they can, like studies in many other scientific fields—in the sphere of space, the atomic nucleus, the physics of explosion, and the theory of atmospheric turbulence. We must broaden scientific contacts between scientists from various countries both in resolving the scientific problem facing mankind and also when elaborating the texts of future international agreements that preclude the use of science's achievements in the military sphere.

[Petrov] You get the impression that the author of the article in THE SUNDAY TIMES is concerned by the prospect of strengthening contacts between our country's scientists and foreign colleagues in conditions of a reduction in tension and mutual suspicion. The slant of the article on chemical weapons aims to impart a militarist hue to our scientific studies and mold public opinion to be suspicious and cautious in cooperation with us. The West is endeavoring to keep our country's readiness to expand scientific contacts and cooperate within a definite restrictive framework and regulate exports to the USSR of state-of-the-art equipment for scientific studies.

[Yevstafyev] It would be better if certain Western journalists who engage in elaborating fantastic scenarios about the chemical destruction of Denmark or Britain directed their mental efforts to elaborating concrete proposals on chemical disarmament. At a recent international conference in Canberra, government and industrial representatives put forward an interesting initiative opposing chemical weapons, proposing the creation of international scientific and technical groups to help prepare this convention. Perhaps, THE SUNDAY TIMES will submit an initiative to create a similar group of journalists.

Petrov Interviewed on Chemical Weapons

AU1310101989 Zagreb DANAS in Serbo-Croatian 3 Oct 89 pp 53-55

["Exclusive" interview with Lieutenant General Stanislav V. Petrov, commander of the Soviet Chemical Troops, by Miroslav Lazanski: "A Farewell to Chemical Arms"—in Moscow, date not given]

[Text] Moscow (by DANAS special correspondent)—The United States is ready to destroy its stockpiles of chemical weapons completely. U.S. President George Bush announced this in his recent speech to the participants of the 44th session of the United Nations General Assembly. Washington has announced the possibility of eliminating its chemical weapons in the next 10 years, on condition that the other countries that possess them join the initiative. For a long time now, the Soviet Union itself has been suggesting that steps be taken to totally eliminate chemical weapons, so it is understandable that President Bush's speech was well received in Moscow. However, what does the Soviet military establishment think about the problem of eliminating chemical combat means?

Lieutenant General Stanislav V. Petrov is the commander of the Soviet forces for chemical warfare, that is, the main person in the Soviet Army in charge of chemical defense. Gen Petrov took up this post recently and the interview he gave to DANAS is his first interview to a journalist. I talked to Gen Petrov in the special salon of the Moscow International Press Center, the same salon in which British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan received journalists during their visits to Moscow.

DANAS: Comrade General, what is the present position of the Soviet Union regarding the ban on chemical weapons and how far has one gone in destroying these weapons in the USSR?

Petrov: Our stand results from the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union. We persistently insist on the elimination of both nuclear weapons and chemical weapons. In this respect one should recall the statement made by M.S.Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January 1986 in which he said that the Soviet Union considers total liquidation of chemical weapons during this century to be an absolutely realistic task. This time I shall not dwell on the entire complex, that is, the entire scale of our peaceful initiatives which have been undertaken in the sphere of chemical disarmament and strengthening the measures of openness [otvorenost] and confidence. I shall only say that after adopting the political decision on the need to sign a

comprehensive and effective convention banning chemical weapons and destroying their stockpiles, the Soviet Union will continue to make efforts in this direction. Of course, we invite all countries, and first of all the United States, to follow our example. As regards our stockpiles of chemical weapons, they do not exceed 50,000 tonnes of toxic substances and we have said this several times already. We have also presented our decision to stop producing chemical weapons and to prepare ourselves to start destroying them completely.

DANAS: Who possesses larger stockpiles of chemical weapons, the Soviet Union or the United States?

Petrov: I have already told you that our stockpiles of chemical weapons amount to about 50,000 tonnes. The United States refrains from giving precise figures on its potentials of chemical combat means and it is therefore difficult to answer your question.

There are different estimates of American stockpiles of chemical weapons, just as there are different estimates of our stockpiles. I want to point out, however, that we have stopped all further production of chemical weapons, but the United States is still accumulating stockpiles by producing binary poisons. If we take as the starting point the estimate that the chemical potentials of the Soviet Union and the United States are approximately equal, then this relative parity will soon be disturbed to the advantage of the United States.

DANAS: The Soviet Union plans to destroy large quantities of chemical weapons. Do you possess sufficient capacity for such an enterprise and does this process of destroying such large quantities of chemical weapons involve any ecological danger?

Petrov: I would agree that this is an extremely serious question. Environmental protection is a problem not only for our country, and one needs all countries to make efforts with a view to preventing an ecological catastrophe. When beginning to construct our institute for destroying chemical weapons, we concentrated our basic attention exactly on human and environmental safety. Studies on the technology of destroying chemical weapons and plans for the industrial zone facilities have been done by specialized scientific research and designer organizations. The technology that we used to destroy chemical weapons in these facilities had been experimentally tested and confirmed in practice during the utilization of the mobile weapons destruction complex over a period of several years. In 1987, we presented this technology to the participants of Geneva disarmament talks. The basic requirement in planning facilities for producing and storing chemical ammunition was to ensure safe working conditions for the personnel in the process of exploitation, as well as the ecological cleanness of the facilities. In doing so we made maximum use of all known experience in transporting and storing toxic substances, ammunition, and equipment. I think that we have achieved a high level of safety in the process of destroying chemical weapons and on the basis of this experience we shall build other enterprises necessary for the total destruction of chemical weapons. Of course, all this is a complex task but, it can be performed by following all possible procedures envisaged in the draft of the future convention. At the moment, we are conducting research in an attempt to find a way to turn toxic substances into useful products. If we could do this, we would be able to compensate at least part of the costs such enterprises entail. We have also been working on creating new, even more modern technologies of destroying chemical weapons with which we will be able to reduce the cost even more. I hope that the scope of all these measures that have been undertaken will help us create the necessary capabilities to destroy chemical weapons within the deadline envisaged by the convention.

DANAS: The population of Chapayevsk where you have been constructing a large installation to destroy chemical weapons is not particularly happy about the choice of the location.

Petrov: Of course, we are not building a factory for candies and cookies there, but a plant for the elimination of chemical weapons, so it is only natural that the people are concerned. However, what they lack is information. We had two commissions, one of which was a government commission, check the technology of eliminating chemical weapons in these plants and they arrived at the conclusion that the technology is completely safe and that it will have no negative effect on either the population or the environment.

DANAS: Can you tell us something about the incident at Sverdlovsk several years ago?

Petrov: What exactly do you mean?

DANAS: Well, there have been reports in the Western press that toxic substances leaked from one of your laboratories which experimented with chemical and biological combat agents and that there were some cases of anthrax.

Petrov: This is the first time I have heard this. I have no information about this incident, but I do have some about the incident at Chelyabinsk. Our press also wrote about it recently.

DANAS: Are you pleased with the fact that the Soviet press is writing today openly and critically about the Soviet Army?

Petrov: The Army should be open toward society, because it is a part of the people and the people have the right to be informed about the Army. Of course, information that is a state or military secret is an exception. Perestroyka works in the Armed Forces, too, so one writes critically even about some things concerning the units of my branch.

DANAS: You have said that the Soviet Union has been destroying its stockpiles of chemical weapons. Some Western analysts say that you have in fact been destroying old types of chemical weapons.

Petrov: In Shikhany in 1987 we demonstrated the destruction of chemical weapons and at that occasion we

demonstrated the method of destroying chemical bombs to foreign observers. Everybody could see that what was involved were not old weapons, because the combat agents we destroyed were operational.

DANAS: Are you also destroying chemical warheads on FROG and SCUD ballistic missiles?

Petrov: I am an expert on the chemical protection of the Soviet Army, and not on chemical warfare. However, since you are asking, we have also demonstrated chemical warheads on FROG and SCUD missiles and the method of destroying them to foreign observers. I can also add here that we never had a chemical charge on this type of missiles when they are deployed outside the Soviet borders. In fact, the Soviet Union has never had or kept chemical weapons outside its territory. We keep our chemical weapons at home.

DANAS: Does the Soviet Army possess an elaborated technology for protection against the neutron bomb? Your T-72 tanks were the first in the world to have an antineutron armor.

Petrov: We have both special and traditional means of protection, as well as some super modern ones. Yes, we possess the technology for protection against the neutron bomb.

DANAS: Is there any problem in connection with the link between chemical and nuclear weapons in the sense that it is difficult to reach an agreement about the elimination of chemical weapons without simultaneously reaching an adequate agreement on nuclear disarmament?

Petrov: Yes, you are right, this problem really exists. What is involved is the simple fact that chemical weapons are more attractive for many developing countries because they are both cheaper and more readily available. In a complex international situation such as the present one, many countries which do not possess nuclear weapons want to have some guarantee of their security, and therefore they try to acquire chemical weapons. This in fact leads to the accumulation of chemical weapons and can hardly be the way to achieve global security. Disarmament and confidence are inseparable concepts and are in fact the basis for international communication. Attempts to "pack" chemical and nuclear weapons together into one package did not meet with approval at the Paris Conference on strengthening the conditions for the operation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. The Paris Conference held in January this year concluded with a resolution adopted by consensus which speaks about the resoluteness of the world community to wage an uncompromising struggle for chemical disarmament.

DANAS: What, in your view, are the problems in the verification [kontrola] of compliance with the treaty on chemical disarmament? Are there any guarantees for effective verification of the convention on a total ban on chemical weapons?

Petrov: There is today no completely elaborated system of international verification and inspection [inspekcija] that would ensure guaranteed compliance with a given provision. The draft convention on banning chemical weapons envisages the application of both national and international verification. We are of the opinion that the system of national control can and should be the basic guarantee of compliance with the convention. Its essence can be summed up as follows: The country that has signed the convention takes upon itself the obligation to carry out—on the basis of legal documents—a stringent verification of all organizations and institutions that, in the opinion of the state, could violate either deliberately or accidentally any of the convention's provisions. The system of international verification is in itself a large body of most complex procedures for verifying whether a country complies with the convention or those of its provisions that apply to the overall activity connected with the elaboration of the elimination of chemical weapons and ranging from the synthesis of toxic substances in laboratories to the destruction of stockpiles of chemical weapons in special enterprises. This system must envisage the verification of all facilities without right of refusal. As regards the existing draft convention, there is one question that has still not been completely coordinated, and that is the possibility of verifying any site or facility on the territory of a state that is a signatory of the convention or beyond that territory, irrespective of the type of ownership of the facility being verified. Privately owned firms and transnational corporations should also be subject to such verification. If they are exempted from the convention, then one cannot speak of effective verification. Of course, it is extremely difficult to verify the production of chemical weapons completely, because new toxic substances can be produced in any laboratory, including even those that do not have much to do with chemistry. Anybody who deals with the production of medicines or pesticides can produce chemical weapons. There are also some practical problems in controlling chemical plants. One should train and pay a large number of inspectors, because there will be hundreds of enterprises that should be monitored [nadgledati]. On the other hand, there is also the problem of business or commercial secrets which foreign experts may penetrate during inspection. There are many other questions that have not been agreed upon. Generally speaking, the Geneva talks still have a serious period to go through, but I think that there are no insurmountable difficulties. It is all a question of time and mutual confidence.

DANAS: What are the shortcomings of the existing agreements banning chemical weapons, that is, what are the "blank spots" of these conventions?

Petrov: When speaking about the 1925 Geneva Protocol or the 1972 Convention Banning Bacteriological Weapons, I can say that the shortcomings of these agreements are known, but shortcomings are characteristic of any international document. The major shortcoming of the 1925 Convention [as published] is its system of verification, or more precisely, the complete lack of one. We have suggested that a procedure for more effective verification be immediately embarked upon in order to ensure compliance with the document. Unfortunately, there has been no reply to our initiative and therefore no progress in this respect.

Another shortcoming of the 1925 agreement is that it pertained to chemical weapons that existed in the twenties and now, at the end of the eighties, arsenals are full of new types of chemical combat agents while the formulations of the agreement remain the same. At the Paris Conference in January this year, the Soviet Union suggested the modernization of the conditions of operation of the 1925 Convention, and I think that the conference accepted such a purpose.

DANAS: Can one achieve a ban on the proliferation of chemical weapons today when many countries have a developed chemical industry?

Petrov: You probably mean the well-known phrase that "chemical weapons are the poor countries' nuclear bomb." It goes without saying that any country with a developed chemical industry can also produce chemical weapons. I have already said that it is difficult to achieve a total ban on the proliferation of chemical weapons simply by issuing international documents, but there is the positive fact that an ever greater number of states are aware of the fact that the danger of chemical war can be removed only through overall efforts on the part of the international community. The fact that an international conference is planned to be held in Australia and to adopt joint measures to prevent the proliferation of chemical weapons, at which representatives of governments and chemical industries of interested countries are going to participate, also confirms the existence of this new awareness. The Soviet Union has great hopes for this conference.

DANAS: Can one use chemical weapons as a cheap way to achieve military supremacy?

Petrov: One can speak about the cheapness of chemical weapons only in comparison with nuclear weapons, and speaking about military supremacy today when there are vast quantities of nuclear arms is not particularly appropriate. If a global international conflict were to break out, no state would choose only weapons that are cheap. Everybody will use the complete arsenal of the means of combat he possesses at the time. What is important here is that the main victims of such a conflict will be civilians. Soldiers of every army possess means of protection from chemical weapons, whereas it is a very complex and difficult task to ensure the protection of the entire population. Imagine what will happen if a chemical war breaks out in Europe. Our estimates put the number of Europeans who would fall victim of modern chemical agents at more than 100 million. The toll among civilians would be 10 times that among soldiers.

DANAS: Does that mean the in the event of war it is better to be a soldier than a civilian?

Petrov: Yes, of course, because soldiers are better trained in how to protect themselves. I want to point out that Europe is our common home and that we must therefore persistently strive to have chemical weapons banned. One must use every opportunity to stop the proliferation of chemical weapons.

DANAS: Has the Soviet army used chemical weapons in Afghanistan?

Petrov: I can say very precisely that the Soviet Union has not used chemical weapons in Afghanistan.

DANAS: Have the mujahidin used chemical weapons in Afghanistan?

Petrov: They have used them against the Afghan Army units. I possess no information that they have used them against Soviet troops.

DANAS: Do you possess any information about the types of chemical weapons the mujahidin used in the fighting in Afghanistan?

Petrov: These were American-made hand grenades and special tablets for poisoning the water.

DANAS: What is the stand of the Soviet Union concerning the ban on binary poisons?

Petrov: Our reply is clear: We advocate a ban on binary as well as all other poisons. In our opinion, binary chemical weapons are the most dangerous because of the potential possibility of their uncontrolled production and the accumulation of reserves, even under existing international agreements. I think that binary chemical weapons are the most serious obstacle on the road toward signing a general convention on banning chemical weapons.

DANAS: Do you think that the United States will accept Soviet proposals on eliminating chemical weapons?

Petrov: I find it difficult to answer that question, although the stands of the United States and the USSR concerning this problem have recently become much closer. What worries me is the American program of modernizing chemical weapons in the sphere of the production of binary poisons. This is why I ask the following question: Why is the United States continuing its production of binary combat agents? Hence my skepticism about American intentions. Yes, I have some doubts about American intentions....

TASS Reports Gerasimov News Briefing 12 Oct

Missile Attack on Kabul

LD1210144289 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—Moslem celebrations in Afghanistan of the birth of Muhammad was marred by an Afghan rebel missile attack on Kabul, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov told a news briefing here that the attack on Kabul killed 36 people and wounded more than 80. He stressed that since the previous festivities the opposition has killed more than 3,000 civilians and wounded more than 7,000. Fifty Mosques and moslem shrines have been destroyed.

Noting the Afghan Government's efforts to restore destroyed mosques and build new temples, Gerasimov said that some 50 million Afghanis have been allocated for this purpose since the start of the Moslem year.

Mideast, Mubarak Visit, Finland's Valtanen

LD1210165489 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—A resolution on palestine, passed by a majority at the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly, is evidence of serious worldwide concern over the situation on the Israeli-occupied territories, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

The Soviet Union believes that the chance of establishing peace in the Middle East has not been lost yet, Gennadiy Gerasimov told a regular news briefing. He pointed out that the world community has a general consensus on the need for a political settlement of the conflict and an international conference involving all interested parties, including Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organisation.

In reply to a question on the time of the possible visit to the Soviet Union of President Husni Mubarak of Egypt, Gerasimov reminded newsmen that the invitation was conveyed to the Egyptian leader by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in February. As for specific dates, the visit is likely to take place at a time convenent for the two sides, he replied. The Soviet Union and Egypt believe that the Soviet-Egyptian dialogue at summit level will help develop friendship and cooperation between the two countries in various fields and reflects the sides' intention to work in this direction.

On behalf of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Gerasimov expressed condolences to the Philippines Foreign Ministry and the entire people of the Philippines over a heavy loss of life following strong typhoons in the country.

The Soviet spokesman also reported that a 54-carriage train with food and building structures, sent from Finland to Afghanistan as part of the humanitarian and economic assistance programme relating to Afghanistan, is passing through Soviet territory according to schedule. In the next few days it will arrive in Termez (on the Soviet-Afghan border) and travel on to the Afghan city of Khayraton. The cost of transporting these supplies through Soviet territory is covered from the Soviet contribution to the U.N. aid programme relating to Afghanistan.

Finnish Commander-In-Chief of Defence Forces General Jaakko Valtanen, who arrived in the Soviet Union on an official visit, met Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov and Chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces Mikhail Moiseyev, Gerasimov said. The sides signed a plan of measures aimed at developing ties between the USSR armed forces and Finland's defence forces for 1990-1991. During the visit, which will last until October 13, General Valtanen will meet officers of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces and visit the cosmonauts' training centre.

Gerasimov commented on the recent statement by West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who urged the GDR Government to carry out political and economic reforms. He stressed that such statements run counter to generally accepted norms of relationships between the two sovereign states.

Gerasimov Cited on Poland at Pact Committee Session

LD1010221289 Warsaw PAP in English 2043 GMT 10 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct. 10—Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov made it clear at a press conference here today that the Soviet Union would not deem it improper should Poland be represented by Wojciech Jaruzelski, Tadeusz Mazowiecki and Lech Walesa at sessions of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee.

"At the hitherto sessions, individual delegations were composed of heads of state, government and the ruling party. Will Jaruzelski, Mazowiecki and Walesa sit side by side on such an occasion in case of today's Poland?" In reply Gerasimov asked the following question: "If these personalities can sit side by side in Warsaw, why should they not do the same elsewhere?"

Both Poland and Hungary are still loyal Warsaw Treaty members in tune with declarations of their leaders and that is why they should take part in the work of organs of this alliance, the Soviet spokesman added.

United Nations Forum Continues, Lukyanov Speaks

PM1210134189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "We Were Born To Live Together"]

[Text] Safeguarding global security and the United Nations: Political, socioeconomic, humanitarian, and ecological aspects—this is the main theme of the 32d session of the plenary assembly of the World Federation of UN Associations, which opened on 9 October in Moscow. It is attended by representatives of national UN associations, membership associations, federations of the actual United Nations and its system, and influential international scientific organizations. During the work special attention will be paid to discussing questions of increasing the aggregate contribution made by the public in various countries of the world to UN activities and the implementation of its aims and tasks and further development of the international movement in support of the United Nations.

The session participants were addressed by A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, who, at M.S. Gorbachev's behest, conveyed the warmest greetings to them and wished them success in their work, which is so important to the cause of peace.

The speaker said that Mikhail Sergeyevich is deeply convinced of the need to seek new paths into the future for mankind, paths of cooperation and mutual understanding, which are conditioned by the prevailing realities in the world today.

Further progress in our world is possible only by seeking general human consensus in the matter of building a new world order.

Everyone can see today that the world is threatened by dangers that demand profound changes in the rules of human intercourse. There are monstrous arsenals of weapons, accumulated in the course of the insane arms race. There are the profound flaws in the world economic system, as a result of which the majority of the world's population is living in conditions that are unacceptable in late 20th century terms. There is an economic crisis, which could have irreparable consequences for the world and its inhabitants. Mankind is sick and tired of wars and bloodshed, which have left only 250 years or so of peace out of a total of 50 centuries.

How to deliver mankind from the threats it faces? This can be done only if states firmly observe the priority of human interests and values, if they consistently seek to abide by the norms of international intercourse, which were proclaimed 44 years ago in the UN Charter, if the course of demilitarization and democratization of international relations becomes the principal line of world politics in general.

We are firmly convinced that a new system of international security cannot be built without the United Nations or outside the United Nations, that the organization's role in world polits must steadily increase. The Soviet Union intends to assist this beneficial process. Growing awareness of the need to enhance the role of the United Nations can also be seen in steps taken by other countries. At the same time, this process needs vigorous stimulation from the general public, from the broadest strata of progressively minded people. Hence the unfading significance of the present forum and the entire activity of the World Federation and the corresponding national UN associations.

We are all witnessing a crucial period for mankind, in which power notions are gradually ceding their former positions. Therefore, at the present stage, it is exceedingly important to unite the efforts of all members of the world community in order to give the buds of the new ideas about the world and its destiny the opportunity to break through the crust of past distrust, errors, and fears.

This attaches more importance than ever before to collective reason and joint efforts by all countries and peoples in solving global problems, problems that can only be solved on the basis of multilateral efforts.

Above all you have the global problem of security as a decisive condition and prerequisite of mankind's future survival on the planet. The key task today is to put a stop to the arms race, to reduce or eliminate altogether the possibility of an international conflict or war, regional or global, breaking out.

You have the global problem of consumption of energy and natural resources. Man must not fall foul of an irresponsible attitude toward energy reosurces. He must exercise control over technology that is designed to generate energy and evaluate it not only in terms of capital investment figures, but also from the viewpoint of its social importance and economic effectiveness.

You have the global food problem. Its solution should envisage the elimination of hunger and malnutrition, which affect millions of people, and, consequently, a substantial improvement of labor productivity in agriculture and equal distribution of food among countries and within countries, and also the creation of a world system of food stocks that will meet the food needs of all the world's citizens.

You have the global problem of development, A.I. Lukyanov went on. In the context of the solution of the problem it is necessary to endeavor to meet the material and spiritual needs of everyone and eliminate the backwardness suffered by entire regions and peoples. This can only be achieved through the concerted efforts of the entire world community, given adequate sources of finance, which can be obtained primarily through disarmament.

Finally, you have the global economic problem, which threatens the actual human race with an entry in the "Red Book" [of endangered species]. The elimination of this threat requires a ban on economic activity that pollutes the environment, restrictions on the use of nonrenewable natural resources, and the careful preservation of nature which is precious and unique.

I am sure that we need a solution to all these problems not for its own sake. It is needed as the basic prerequisite of the humanization of our civilization and creation of conditions in which each state and the entire world community will focus attention on Man, his concerns, rights, and his freedoms. It is clear that the humanization of international relations is impossible without the humanization of the internal life of each individual member country of the international community.

The changes taking place in the Soviet Union, the perestroyka geared to democratizing and humanizing Soviet society, and our foreign policy initiatives based on new thinking, particularly in the sphere of practical disarmament, are well known to you. They reflect the modern world's general need for relations based not on confrontation, but on cooperation, not on the supression of the weak by the strong, but on equal dialogue and the democratic solution of problems that arise.

For all the differences between our notions of desirable paths of social development, the representatives of different social systems are becoming increasingly aware of their common responsibility for the destiny of mankind and for the survival of our civilization. It is the United Nations that is the center where all the threads of this responsibility can and must meet, where the rays of international solidarity converge, as if in a magnifying glass.

The United Nations can and must now become the forum to which states go with their problems in the sphere of security, where they unite their creative efforts in the search for optimal solutions of global problems. As the embodiment of the collective reason of the international community, the United Nations is also meant to act as a just arbiter in the resolution of regional conflicts and a reliable assistant in the elimination of economic difficulties. Finally, it is increasingly becoming an accelerator of the development of cooperation in the sphere of protection of human rights and the engine of their unswerving, universal observance.

That is why it is so important now to consolidate the level of mutual understanding that has been reached and move from it toward positive collaboration and translate coincidence of views and positions into real, concrete action.

In present-day conditions new horizons are opening up for the United Nations in all spheres of its activity: Military-political, economic, scientific-technical, ecological, and humanitarian. Therefore it is extremely important today to have a public dialogue on its new potential and its new tasks. There is no doubt that the present session of the plenary assembly of the World Federation of UN Associaitions will make a fitting contribution to the development of this dialogue. One recalls here the words of the Roman philosopher Seneca, who said: "We were born to live together. And our community is like an arch, which stands because the stones prevent one another from falling."

Indeed we were born to live together. Our close cooperation should be the arch that supports our future, the future of our children, the future of our grandchildren, A.I. Lukyanov stressed in conclusion.

A greetings message from UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar was then read out, in which he conveyed the warmest wishes to the Moscow forum participants. The greetings message notes that the main theme of the assembly session has special significance now that a new political climate is emerging, which opens up new horizons for the solution of regional conflicts and strengthening of the cause of peace. The growing awareness of states' interdependence demands that concrete measures be taken. Real peace can only be ensured if we not only prevent armed conflicts, but struggle to solve other problems, such as poverty, safeguarding human rights, and environmental conservation, the message says.

The assembly session opening ceremony was attended by the heads of foreign countries' diplopmatic missions in the USSR.

The forum will continue for 5 days.

Nuclear Power Spokesman Cited at IAEA Session

PM1210154089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent I. Melnikov report: "Difficulties and Hopes: Reflections After the IAEA Conference"]

[Text] Vienna, October—A routine session of the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] General Conference was held in Vienna recently.

The tone of the discussion was set by the report by IAEA General Director Hans Blix. He agreed that despite the efforts being made, ecological problems have grown from local to regional problems and now constitute a global threat. A sad example of this is the thinning of the ozone layer and the "greenhouse effect," which is the result partly of the burning of organic types of fuel and partly of the cutting down of the forests. And what can one say about nuclear power? In the public's perception, the agency leader acknowledged, it is still associated mainly with the appearance of ecological problems, rather than their alleviation. The development of such feelings is promoted first and foremost by the problems of the burial of waste which remains radioactive for millenia, and by the danger of accidents.

The time I spent at the conference convinced me that the scientists and practitioners developing the nuclear power industry are by no means turning their backs on renewable energy sources, especially solar and wind power. But the question arises: Is it possible by this means to "curb" the pernicious "greenhouse effect?" The international energy agency recently presented a report according to which by the year 2010 these sources could produce at best 5 percent of world energy production.

Much is now said about energy saving. Indeed, this merits every encouragement. But how great is its potential? In the last 15 years the consumption of primary energy in the world has increased by 2.2 percent annually, while in the developing countries the increase was more than twice that figure. Specialists believe that these trends will persist.

Another eloquent fact. At the "Austria Center" a pamphlet was distributed on global warming, published by the French Government. Carbon dioxide emissions in France, it notes, totaled 450 million tonnes in 1973. In 1985 they had fallen to 325 million tonnes, and a large proportion of the emissions were avoided through the use of nuclear power.

By what means does the IAEA intend to tackle safety problems? First, through technological changes. Second, by devoting particular attention to operating safety. Some progress has already been made. Mention was made at the session of modifications carried out in the USSR to all reactors of the RBMK [high-power pressure tube] type. The introduction in a number of countries of decompression filter systems in the containment structures at existing power stations did not go unnoticed. There was a lively debate over the development and design of new reactor models and systems with enhanced safety characteristics. It was stated that governments must examine the possibility of the design and development of a new type or types of power reactors under the agendy's auspices. So that expenditure on designs is not too heavy a burden for individual states, the IAEA proposes pooling efforts at international level.

There are now more than 400 nuclear power stations in operation in the world, and concern for the operational safety of every one of them is basically a matter for all mankind.

On the final day of the session I talked with A. Protsenko, head of our delegation. He dwelt particularly on the problem of burying radioactive waste, which is, in his view, resolved far more scrupulously and conscientiously than in the chemical, pharmaceutical, and other sectors of industry. He reported that the agency secretariat took a positive view of the USSR's initiative to organize an international research center at Chernobyl.

What changes have there been in our country's policy on nuclear power? Apart from increasing safety at the country's existing nuclear power stations, my interviewee told me, work is proceeding in two areas: The creation of a design for a safer station, the implementation of which could begin in literally a year from now, and the design of a highly improved nuclear power station capable of coming on stream by approximately the year 2000.

I asked A. Protsenko which project is our nuclear power industry's "favorite." I look at this from just one viewpoint—that of safety, he replied. In this respect, the "favorites" include the Gorkiy nuclear heat supply station. The IAEA experts who recently investigated it gave a very high assessment of this project.

Petrovskiy 'Satisfied' With United Nations Debate

LD1310090489 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 13 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes:

The 44th U.N. General Assembly completed its general political debate on Thursday. Representatives from the overwhelming majority of the 159 U.N. member states, including presidents, prime ministers, and foreign ministers from many countries, spoke at the general debate which lasted nearly three weeks.

They set out their governments' viewpoints on the most important issues of our times. These issues include the relaxation of international tension, cuts in weapons and disarmament, stronger international security, the settlement of regional conflicts, accelerated social and economic development, the control of terrorism and the spread of drug addiction.

This year the situation was favorable for a business-like and fruitful discussion. The start of the general debate coincided with the announcement of the forthcoming Soviet-American summit late in the spring or early in the summer of 1990 as well as with the successful talks between Eduard Shevardnadze and James Baker. This favourably influenced the debate.

Sharing his impressions about the debate, session President Joseph Garba of Nigeria said in the final remarks that all speakers pointed to the importance of the general relaxation of international tension and, in particular, the improvement of relations between the two great powers—the USSR and the United States.

These developments will help the community of nations concentrate on the present-day imperatives and on making the world better. He singled out the most important problems, including the spread of hunger and poverty, weak economic development, the spread of drug addiction, the threat to the environment, and violations of the human rights of millions of people in the world.

All speakers at the general debate pointed out that the United Nations should continue to play the key role in mankind's efforts to ensure peace, justice and international cooperation, Garba pointed out.

The Soviet Union attached great importance to the general political debate, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy told TASS. The general debate showed the attitude of U.N. member states to processes in the world and to renovating trends at the United Nations.

"We are satisfied with the results of the debate. It showed that the ideas expressed by the Soviet Union at the session are consonant with the sentiments of the international community," Petrovskiy said.

Many new ideas aired at the session by several U.N. member countries evoked lively interest. As for the efforts to improve Soviet-American relations, according to general opinion, they blended well with general efforts to normalise the international situation as a whole.

Many delegates called for stimulating a stable, yet dynamic, advance towards restructuring international relations with active United Nations' participation.

The debate showed that the overwhelming majority of U.N. members are ready to increase the U.N. peace-making potential, to consolidate the organisation's turn to practical activities, to raise U.N. efficiency and to ensure the primacy of international law, Petrovskiy said in conclusion.

United States & Canada

CIA, KGB Retirees Discuss Antiterrorism Fight

PM1310103189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[P. Timofeyev article: "KGB-CIA. A Step Toward Each Other"]

[Text] "USSR-United States: Joint Response to International Terrorism"—a few years ago hardly anyone could have foreseen the emergence of an organization with this name. It unites public figures, journalists, lawyers, and diplomats from both countries. The Soviet delegation that returned from the United States the other day included former ranking KGB officers—Lieutenant General (Retired) F.A. Shcherbak and Major General (Retired) V.V. Zvezdenkov. Their arrival in the United States, their participation in the discussions, and their statements on U.S. TV and in the press caused a real sensation. In Santa Monica, California the guests were received by former CIA Director William Colby, his former deputy Ray Cline, and other prominent U.S. public figures.

The meeting resulted in a package of approximately 30 recommendations being worked out in arranging bilateral cooperation in the fight against terrorism—measures which will soon be submitted to Soviet and U.S. state and government organs. Journalists were familiarized with some of these proposals at a press conference held yesterday at the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace.

Among other recommendations the sides agreed—and this has already been agreed by the two countries' special services—to provide assistance to each other in investigating acts of sabotage against civil aircraft, to exchange the equipment needed to discover explosives, to coordinate the struggle against underground weapons dealers, devoting particular attention to groupings striving to acquire mass destruction weaponry, to give joint diplomatic support to governments making efforts to combat the drugs barons, and to exchange information on Soviet and U.S. citizens held by terrorists.

It was also proposed that a standing working group be set up to exchange information between the KGB and the CIA.

The following figure was quoted at the press conference: In the past few years more than 60 Soviet citizens have been killed at the hands of terrorists abroad. According to U.S. figures, our country ranks fifth in terms of the number of its citizens killed abroad as a result of acts of terrorism.

The speeches by the Soviet delegation members noted that the main achievement of the dialogue that has been begun between Soviet and U.S. specialists is the destruction of the widely held idea imposed on the Western world over many years that the Soviet Union is the nerve center of international terrorist operations. Of course, the Santa Monica meeting participants were unable to reach agreement on all questions—in particular, approaches to the continuing bloodshed in Afghanistan differed sharply, and there were also differences over the assessment of the well-known events in Lebanon last summer, events which have become known as the "hostage war." But, on the whole, the discussion revealed an overall position: The use of terrorist methods is criminal, whatever goal they may be pursuing.

It was noted at a press conference that the Soviet-U.S. society to combat terrorism is open to other states.

San Diego 'People's Diplomacy' Forum Reported

PM1210112989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[G. Zafesov, G. Lokshin report: "Steps in People's Diplomacy"]

[Text] People's diplomacy is gaining increasing public recognition. This is borne out, for instance, by the Soviet-U.S. forum on human rights which ended a few days ago. Its first session was held at the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace in Moscow in December of last year. And now another meeting has been held. This time Soviet guests were welcomed on American soil, first in San Diego and then in New York.

More than 200 hundred representatives of various U.S. scientific and religious organizations took part in the discussions. The delegation of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace also included scientists, public and religious figures, and journalists. The discussions were frank, relaxed, and amicable. In actual fact people's diplomacy has to be like that. Mutual understanding was achieved on many questions.

So, regular exchanges of students and teaching staff are to be organized between San Diego University and the All-Union Juridical Institute. Contacts have been established between the journal CHELOVEK I ZAKON and a number of U.S. publications. The meeting participants will exchange literature on problems of the organization of peaceful demonstrations and rallies.

A draft Soviet-U.S. citizens' treaty on ecological safety, in whose preliminary elaboration dozens of ecological groups and prominent lawyers from both countries had taken part, was discussed in detail during the meeting. The draft contains a number of new legal standards and could, in the opinion of the meeting participants, be of practical significance for the development of cooperation between the USSR and the United States in this sphere.

In order to add a constructive character to the discussion of the full range of human rights problems within the framework of the Soviet-American forum a permanently functioning consensus council is to be set up. The forum

itself is to be open to representatives of the Helsinki documents signatory countries in the future.

Soviet participants were able to visit the San Diego prison, a hostel for the homeless, and an Indian reservation and to acquaint themselves with police work methods.

The second Soviet-American forum on human rights has shown that there are many questions whose solutions could be promoted by people's diplomacy.

TASS on U.S. Conference on Soviet Developments

LD1110111389 Moscow TASS in English 1034 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] Davidson October 11 TASS—By TASS special correspondent Yuriy Kirilchenko:

Reforms in the Soviet Union as a key historical process of our times—this is the topic of a scientific conference which opened here on Tuesday.

"The idea of holding such a forum came from our students", TASS was told by Jack Perry, director of the Davidson College International Research Programme. It is a reflection of the interest shown by Americans today in Soviet affairs. Representatives of academic circles, political and public leaders have gathered to analyse the latest developments in the USSR, as well as vital problems of Soviet-American relations.

We are eyewitnesses of a "thrilling and difficult period", Alexander Dallin, representative of Stanford University who heads the International Council for Soviet and East European Research, pointed out in his opening speech. He said that it is now very difficult for Sovietologists to forecast further developments in the USSR. He noted that the longer perestroika continues, the more irreversible it becomes.

Many American experts point out that the reforms in Soviet external and internal policy correspond to the interests of the United States. Nevertheless, Thomas Naylor, economics professor at Duke University, believes that Washington had done little, as of yet, to promote better relations between the two countries. The United States, he stressed, has made no visible attempts to rid Soviet-American trade of political fetters.

Naylor pointed out that the U.S. Government had put up huge obstacles to the growth of trade between the two countries. He noted that the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which makes the granting of most favoured nation treatment to the USSR conditional on Jewish emigration, was a hangover of the Cold War and should be annulled. Naylor believes the Pentagon's senseless anti-Soviet technological policy should be replaced by a policy based on present-day realities and not yesterday's myths.

At the same time, many conference participants expressed the view that it would take months and even years to do away with artificial barriers to Soviet-American commercial and economic relations. This view was shared by Marshall Shulman, former leading State Department expert on Soviet affairs in the Carter administration. Today he is a researcher of the Harriman Institute for the Advancement Study of the Soviet Union at Columbia University.

However, Shulman believes that the time has come for the United States to approach problems of arms control more seriously. He pointed out that the INF treaty was useful, because it scrapped a part of the armaments and implemented appropriate inspections. But this is only a minor part of the problem, Shulman mentions. It is now necessary to go all out to reach agreements on a reduction of strategic weapons, as well as conventional armed forces and armaments.

China

Special Events in Moscow Mark PRC National Day

Soviet Scholars Hold Enlarged Session

OW1210190789 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 7 Oct 89

[Text] The Far Eastern Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences held an enlarged session of its academic committee in Moscow on 6 October to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. Attending the session were scientists from the institute; scholars working at social sciences research institutes in Moscow; representatives of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Zhang Zhen, minister counselor of the Chinese Embassy to the USSR.

At the session, Titarenko, director of the Far Eastern Institute under the USSR Academy of Sciences, delivered a report marking the 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. Soviet scholars (Korovarov) and (Geliy Galiyev) and others gave reports on China's various social problems.

Meeting at Trade Union Building

OW1310053589 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 30 Sep 89

[Text] A meeting to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China was solemnly held on 29 September at the stadium of the Trade Union Building in Moscow. Our station reporter Vasilyev reported:

Seated on the rostrum were Medvedev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee; Karabasov, secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee; Laverov, chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology; representatives of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, All-Union Central Council

of Trade Unions, Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and USSR-PRC Friendship Society; Chinese Ambassador to USSR Yu Hongliang and Vice President of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries Liu Gengyin.

A band struck up the national anthems of China and the Soviet Union. Laverov, chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology, made a speech at the meeting.

He said: Today, the representatives of the people of all walks of life in Moscow have gathered together in this hall of historic nature to warmly celebrate a festive day—the 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. This is a great festival day for the Chinese people. The victory of the people's revolution brought about national rejuvenation for the Chinese people and helped them eliminate poverty and enhance creativity. It greatly changed the destiny of the hundreds of millions of people in the country. The working class in China, who take their destiny into their own hands, worked selflessly and brought about fundamental changes in their motherland within a very short period under the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

Comrade Laverov continued: In various stages of modern history, the Soviet people have always given full support to the Chinese people in an overall manner. The people in both countries have warmly welcomed the positive changes in relations between the Soviet Union and China in recent years. The Soviet-Chinese summit meeting held in Beijing in May this year was one of epoch-making significance. The relations of the two countries entered a new era due to the results of this meeting. All the Soviet people join us here today in celebrating the 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. Our friendly relations and cooperation with China will definitely further expand and strengthen in the future.

In conclusion, Comrade Laverov wished the Chinese people fresh achievements in creatively carrying out labor and every Chinese family peace, prosperity, and successes.

Yu Hongliang, Chinese ambassador to USSR also made a speech at the meeting. He said: Esteemed Comrade Medvedev and esteemed Comrade Laverov, as well as dear comrades and friends, today, the Soviet people of all walks of life are gathering together here to mark the 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. This fully reflects the Soviet people's traditional friendship with the Chinese people and their enthusiasm and concerns over China's socialist construction and reform program. I wish to wholeheartedly thank the Soviet people for all this and take this opportunity to extend, on behalf of the Chinese people, my highest respect and best regards to the great Soviet people.

Ambassador Yu Hongliang briefed those attending the meeting on China's achievements in the economic and other fields and talked about China's economic and political reform programs. He believed that the relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries in all fields of endeavor would further develop. The artists of both countries gave literary and art performances at the end of the meeting.

Friendship Society Lecture Meeting

OW0810010789 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] An enlarged lecture meeting was held by the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society in the Cultural Palace of the (Vlajilir Ilychi) Electric Machinery Plant in Moscow on 27 September to mark the 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. The participants at the meeting discussed the urgent issues in China's domestic and foreign policies. Some of the Soviet Union's famous China experts briefed the audience on the Chinese people's achievements over the last 40 years and on that country's on-going reforms.

USSR-PRC Cooperation Viewed on National Day

OW1310052589 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 15 Sep 89

[From the "Half an Hour With Wang Xiao" program]

[Text] This 1 October marks the 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. During the past 40 years, Chinese people made outstanding achievements in economic, political, cultural, and other fields. Today the country still maintains its fast march forward. China's contacts with foreign nations, including the Soviet Union, have been expanding as well. Now we will ask (Giliyangnova), responsible person of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, to talk about cooperation between the Soviet Union and China in the sphere of economics and trade. (Giliyangnova) said:

Our two nations' economic and trade contacts have grown in recent years. The volume of trade between the two nations, valued at 1,850 million rubles last year, increased by 900 percent since the early 1980's. The volume of goods exchange is expected to continue to increase in 1989, to approach 2 billion rubles. Machines and equipment made up almost half of the Soviet commodities exported to China. The Soviet Union hopes to expand the export of machines and equipment, including (word indistinct) mechanical products. China exported primarily light industrial products, grain, industrial raw materials, and machines and technical products to the Soviet Union.

The new situation in trade opened up broad possibilities. First of all, there was the possibility of expanding border trade between the two nations and establishing direct inter-city and inter-regional contacts. Border trade between the various oblasts and cities in the Soviet Far East and China's northeast provinces and between the Soviet Republics in the central and eastern regions and

the Kazakh SSR and China's northwest provinces and autonomous regions need to be further expanded.

The two nations' economic cooperation has been continuously enhanced. The 1985 Agreement on Economic and Technological Cooperation has begun to take effect. The Soviet Union is to carry out or rebuild some 17 industrial projects in China under the agreement. These projects cover the fields of energy, metallurgy, machinery, and chemistry. In addition, relevant Soviet departments will provide equipment for projects not in the agreement, the construction project on the Nanjing thermal power plant is noteworthy. The Soviet Union will provide the project with a loan on favorable terms.

The Soviet-Chinese summit talks held in Beijing this May added new possibilities to the development of the two nations' economic and trade relations, ensuring an all-around and sustained growth in the next few years. In July, the two sides in Moscow discussed specific measures in detail to implement the agreement reached during the May summit. The cooperation measures discussed involve energy, transportation, metallurgy, aviation, forestry, light industry, agriculture, medical science, public heath, and other fields. Development of new forms of cooperation also were discussed at the meeting.

Both the Soviets and the Chinese at the meeting believe that there is great potential for the two nations' developing mutually beneficial economic and trade cooperation and raising this cooperation to a higher level that corresponds with their national strength. They also believe that such cooperation is conducive to both the Soviet Union's and China's reforms.

PRC National Day, Normalization of Ties Discussed

OW1010023489 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 30 Sep 89

[Text] The 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China falls on 1 October. Our station commentator Nikolayev writes in this connection as follows:

What makes people happy is the fact that this is the first year since the complete normalization of Sino-Soviet relations. It has clearly shown that this has had a favorable impact on the world arena. It is conducive to promoting peace and strengthening security in the Asian-Pacific Region. Demonstrating a strong sense of responsibility, both Moscow and China have taken steps for peace. All this negates the concept that hostility between the two countries will last for a long time. Their joint efforts for peace have helped eliminate tension and strengthen regional security in Asia. In the past several years, particularly since the complete normalization of relations between the two countries, tremendous changes have taken place in Asia. Both the Soviet Union and China have taken bold measures to reduce their armed forces. Taking China's interests into consideration, Moscow has agreed to dismantle some of its intermediate-range guided missiles deployed in Asia. On the basis of the Geneva agreement, the Soviet Union had withdrawn its troops from Afghanistan, and reduced the number of Soviet troops temporarily stationed in Mongolia. In the process of helping settle the Cambodian issue, it had also assisted in the stage-by-stage withdrawal of the Vietnamese Volunteer Army from Cambodia. Today, there is not a single Vietnamese soldier in Cambodia. All this has created excellent conditions for the fundamental improvement of Sino-Soviet relations. We may say that many countries in Asia have never expected the normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and China. Practice has indicated that the improvement in Sino-Soviet relations will not harm the interests of any third nation. The Soviet Union and China respect each others' allies. Neither country will do anything to harm the interests of their allies or their relations with such allies because of the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations. On the contrary, the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and China has led to the improvement of relations between China on the one side and India and Mongolia on the other. This improvement of bilateral relations has also led to the political dialogue between China and Vietnam, helped settle the Cambodian issue, and invigorated the political life of the Asian-Pacific Region. I believe that strengthening Sino-Soviet cooperation on the basis of mutual benefit, and helping each other to deal with international affairs will become an important factor in promoting regional internationalism. I believe that both Asia and the whole world trust that the new-type relations between the Soviet Union and China are conducive to stabilizing the international situation.

Anniversary of USSR-PRC Diplomatic Ties Noted

Yu Marks Anniversary of Relations

OW1210191189 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 7 Oct 89

[Text] Chinese Ambassador to the USSR Yu Hongliang held a reception on 6 October to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and China. Attending the reception were Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers; Katushev, minister of Foreign Economic Relations; Rogachev, deputy foreign minister; and other officials. In their speeches, those attending the reception pointed out that China and the Soviet Union must maintain good-neighborly relations and cooperate closely with each other. There is no other way. Developing Sino-Soviet relations along this path tallies with the fundamental interests of both countries and the whole world. The reception was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Officials Gather at 5 Oct Soiree

OW1310015289 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 10 Oct 89

[Excerpts] Representatives of Soviet political circles and their Chinese friends gathered [on 5 October] in the House of Chinese People's Friendship in Moscow to mark the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and China and the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society.

Present at the soiree were Comrade Chaplin, Soviet deputy foreign minister; members of the Chinese Embassy in Moscow, headed by Ambassador Yu Hongliang; veteran workers who had worked in China; Soviet army veterans who liberated China's northeastern provinces from the hands of the Japanese aggressors; Moscow college students studying the Chinese language; and Chinese students studying in the Soviet Union.

Academician Tikhvinskiy, chairman of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, delivered a report at the soiree. He recalled his participation in the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and China.

Recalling a meeting in Tiananmen Square 40 years ago, at which the founding of the People's Republic of China was proclaimed, Academician Tikhvinskiy said: [speaking in Russian fading into announcer's Mandarin translation] As Soviet Consul-General in Beijing then, I was among other foreign guests on the right-hand reviewing stand. An aide of PRC Premier and Foreign Minister Comrade Zhou Enlai walked over to me and told me that Comrade Zhou Enlai would hand me an urgent letter soon and asked me to inform Moscow of the contents of the letter immediately. I received Zhou Enlai's letter soon after I returned to the Soviet Consulate-General from Tiananmen Square. In the envelope were the declaration of the founding of the People's Republic of China and Zhou Enlai's letter, in which he requested the Soviet Union establish diplomatic relations with the newly-founded People's Republic of China. I translated the two documents into Russian and cabled their contents to Moscow. On the next day, 2 October, the Soviet Government informed the Chinese side that it had recognized the People's Republic of China and agreed to exchange ambassadors. China's establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and the people's democratic countries [as heard] helped consolidate the international status of the People's Republic of China and helped frustrate the imperialists' economic blockade and attempt at aggression.

Comrade Tikhvinskiy added: In the 40 years of Sino-Soviet relations, there was a period of vigorous development of bilateral relations in the 1950's, a period of worsening relations in the 1960's and 1970's, and a period of gradual improvement of bilateral relations in the 1980's. Comrade Gorbachev's visit to China in May this year opened up a new chapter in the history of Sino-Soviet relations. In the joint communique of the Sino-Soviet summit meeting, the leaders of the two countries pointed out that the Soviet Union and China will actively develop in a planned way their relations in the economic, trade, scientific, technological, cultural, and other fields on the basis of the principle of equality and mutual benefit. [passage omitted]

Chinese Ambassador to the Soviet Union Yu Hongliang also spoke during the soiree. He said: [Begin recording] We have just celebrated the 40th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. Today, we are attending this soiree held by the USSR Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society to mark the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and the Soviet Union and the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Association [as heard]. On the next day after the birth of New China, the Soviet Government recognized it and the two great socialist neighboring countries established formal diplomatic relations. The establishment of diplomatic relations between China and the Soviet Union was the result of the development of traditional friendship between Chinese and Soviet peoples. As we all know, many sons and daughters of Chinese working people gave their valuable lives in defense of the Soviet regime in as early as the year of the October Revolution. Many Soviet Red Army fighters died in China during the war in which they opposed Japanese imperialists' aggression and helped Chinese people liberate China's northeastern provinces. When New China was restoring its economy and laying an industrial foundation in its early years, Soviet people gave great assistance to the Chinese people. Chinese people treasure very much the friendship that they established with Soviet people during the years of revolutionary struggle and construction. They always cherish the memory of those who contributed to Sino-Soviet friendship. Currently, our two countries are deepening reforms in all fields of society and people's life. Although the situation and the way of reform in the two countries are different, we can learn from, and exchange, experience with each other in the course of reform. This exchange is a new content in the relations between the CPC and the CPSU and between the two countries. Chinese people are following with great interest the progress of reform in the Soviet Union, and wholeheartedly wish it success. [end recording]

Soviet and Chinese artists gave a performance during the soiree. [passage omitted]

Establishment of PRC-USSR Ties Hailed

OW1310004189 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 2 Oct 89

[Text] October 2 is the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. In this connection, our station commentator (Karavayev) writes:

The Soviet Union was the first country to officially announce its recognition of the People's Republic of China on the second day following the proclamation of its founding. Of course, this was by no means accidental. The Soviet people have consistently sympathized with and supported the Chinese people in their effort to make their motherland an independent and prosperous country.

In the past 40 years there was a period of cooperation and alliance between the Soviet Union and China, but there was also a time when there was discord and estrangement between the two countries. Now that the abnormal phenomenon of the past has ended, both sides have made great efforts and have shown sincere determination to restore normal relations between the two countries. Because of the efforts of both sides, a new period in the development of relations between the two greatest socialist countries has begun in the comparatively short period of time since they moved from the political consultation which began in 1982 to the Soviet-Chinese summit in May of this year. The internal needs of the two countries—that is, the reforms of the Soviet Union and China—required that they completely normalize their relations. Now that their relations have been normalized, the two countries have recognized that it is necessary to give priority to developing economic and trade cooperation and exchanging experiences in socialist construction. The Soviet Union and China have firmly stated that the past practice of imposing one's own pattern of development on another will no longer be repeated. The relations between both sides are established on the basis of equality and mutual benefit and on the basis of the general principle of peaceful coexistence. Our relations are developing in the direction agreed upon, and trade and economic cooperation is being gradually accelerated. This has set the stage for dialogue between the two parties. There are frequent exchanges between the parliamentary bodies of the two countries, and contacts between social organizations are increasing. Strengthening mutual understanding and trust will be conducive to demilitarizing the Soviet-Chinese border and turning it into a peaceful and good-neighborly border. In other words, Soviet-Chinese relations are improving. Of course, both sides are aware that earnest long-term work must be done in the future to reinforce their cooperation with concrete contents and practical actions. There may be difficulties on this road. In short, as pointed out by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in a recent speech: "The prospects for Sino-Soviet cooperation are bright."

Soviet, Chinese Friendship Groups Sign Agreement

OW0310122589 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 2 Oct 89

[By reporter Vasilyev from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] The Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society signed a cooperative agreement on 2 October in Moscow with the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association. The following is a report on this by our reporter Vasilyev:

Signing the agreement on the Soviet side was (Shivizova), vice chairman of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Realtions with Foreign Countries, while representing the Chinese side to sign the agreement was Liu Gengyin, vice president of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries. Both delivered brief speeches at the signing ceremony.

[(Shivizova) is briefly heard speaking in Russian, fading out after a few seconds] (Shivizova) said: Today we have signed a 2-year cooperative agreement. This was done at an important time marking the 40th founding anniversary of the People's Republic of China. The Soviet poeple have pointed out with satisfaction that the friendship organizations of the two countries have made contributions to enhancing the mutual understanding of the two countries and two peoples and their cause of good-neighborliness, friendship, and cooperation. The 2-year new cooperative plan calls for a remarkable expansion and enhancement of cooperation between the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society on the one hand and the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foriegn Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association on the other hand, including their main offices at the central level and their branches in various loclaities.

(Shivizova) concluded his speech by expressing the firm belief that the friendship organizations of the two countries will continue to work for the lofty ideal of general peace and international prosperity.

In his speech, Vice President Liu Genyang said: The signing of the 1990-91 cooperative plan symbolized a new start point of the friendly contacts between the Chinese and Soviet peoples. The Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association will, as always, be willing to continue to join the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society in making fresh contributions to consolidating and developing the traditional friendship and good-neighborly relations between the two countries and two peoples.

Also present at the signing ceremony were Academician Tikhvinskiy, chairman of the central board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, and Zhang Zhen, minister of the Chinese Embassy in the Soviet Union.

Commentary on Foreign Policies of USSR, PRC

OW0910084889 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] Dear listeners, the following is a commentary by Volskiy, a Soviet journalist on international issues, on the foreign policies of the Soviet Union and China. Writing on the prospects of security in the Asia-Pacific region, he says:

There are growing indications of irreconcilable political trends in the Asia-Pacific region, as in other parts of the world. On the one hand, new political thinking has been spreading. This is evidenced by the principled declaration on a world free of nuclear weapons and violence signed by the Soviet Union and India 3 years ago. In the southern part of the Asia-Pacific region, the new thinking is expressed in the Rarotonga Treaty, of which the Soviet Union and China are members, that declares the southern Pacific a nuclear-free zone. The first practical steps have been taken in the direction of nuclear disarmament in the Asia-Pacific region. Under the Soviet proposal, the Soviet-U.S. treaty to destroy medium-range missiles also applies to the Asia-Pacific region. After the signing of the Geneva accords on the Afghan issue and the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan, greater enthusiasm has been shown for the settlement of regional conflicts.

However, this is only one aspect of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region. The opposite aspect is that the U.S. militarists, with the backing of their Japanese allies, have enhanced, rather than lowered, combat readiness in this region. For instance, a naval exercise of an unprecedented scale was held here this autumn. It is reported that a U.S. military base may be set up in Singapore, and that the U.S. 7th Fleet, which is in need of the new base, is expected to expand by 10 percent by 1990. Propaganda has been launched to defend this combat readiness.

Comrade Gorbachev has pointed out that the process of militarization in this region has been stepped up under the erroneous assumptions that only through armed forces and the show of force can peace be achieved, and that security is more reliable only in a state of confrontation. Apparently under the present situation, reliable security in the Asia-Pacific region can only be guaranteed by the constructive efforts of the countries in this region.

Of course, the Soviet Union and China are playing a great role in this area. Normalization of relations between the two countries after the Soviet-Chinese summit has also laid the groundwork for coordinating their actions in consolidating peace in the Asia-Pacific region. The September visit to China by the Soviet parliamentary delegation led by Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, again testified to this point. Of course, the views of our countries on some questions are different, but we are able to take joint, parallel, or separate action. The important thing is that the two countries have clearly made constructive efforts in specific areas such as disarmament, the settlement of regional conflicts and other controversial political issues, and the promotion of mutually beneficial economic cooperation.

It is widely known that the Soviet Union has proposed a wide-ranging cooperation program for the Asia-Pacific region, which Comrade Gorbachev expounded in his speeches in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk. The Soviet Union has also unilaterally reduced its Army and armaments in Asia to support this program. It will certainly help the prospects of consolidating peace in the Asia-Pacific region if all the Asia-Pacific countries will assume this attitude.

PRC's Crises, Problems 'Now Being Resolved'

LD0610213389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 6 Oct 89

[From the "International Situation: Questions and Answers" program; presented by Stanislav Blazhenkov, foreign political commentator of All-Union Radio; taking part in the program are: Mikhail Leontevich , Ph.d., director of the Far East Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; corespondent Yuriy Isayev; and commentator Andrey Ptashnikov.]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Titorenko] If we are to talk about the internal political situation, it is presently stable, although it is known that our listeners, the public in China and abroad, were very alarmed by those events which occurred in China in May and June of this year and by that serious political crisis that arose in the country. It was resolved, as you know, in an extremely dramatic manner. At the present time, the party and the government, together with the public is in general overcoming that crisis and is on the path to improving the political system, to improving socialist democracy, and on the path of setting right the party's policy with regard to all social strata, including the working class, the peasantry, especially the intelligentsia, and young people.

The celebration of the 40th anniversary of the PRC and the ceremonial meeting that was held in Beijing have shown that the present situation in the country is becoming stable; problems that cropped up in the course of reform and contradictions between the different social groups which were made use of by certain antisocialist elements are now being resolved. [passage omitted]

China's Chemical Weapons Stance Viewed Favorably

OW0910040889 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 4 Oct 89

[Commentary by station observer Alekseyev]

[Text] At a news briefing a few days ago, Li Zhaoxing, spokesman for the PRC Foreign Ministry, said that

China has always stood for thoroughly destroying chemical weapons. He stated that China desires the early signing of an international convention on the thorough destruction of chemical weapons, as well as active participation in related talks.

Station observer Alekseyev writes the following in this regard:

The Chinese representative's statement shows the consistent and unchanging stand of China on the matter of chemical weapons. The Soviet Union highly appraises this principled stand.

Apparently, it is not accidental that the Chinese Foreign Ministry has decided to expound China's stand on chemical weapons once again. The recent meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State Baker in the state of Wyoming demonstrated that this problem can and should be solved on an extensive international basis. In addition, the consent of many countries should be obtained. Li Zhaoxing was entirely correct in saying that since the Soviet Union and the United States have a large number of chemical weapons in stock, it is their primary responsibility to ban such weapons. This is undoubtedly true.

At the talks in Wyoming, the Soviet Union and the United States reached agreement on a number of difficult issues, including the procedure for verifying the nonproduction and destruction of chemical weapons. Looking back at the history of this issue, we clearly see that this is a big step forward, for the question of verification was always a stumbling block. The Soviet Union has done everything possible to hold the initiative in its own hands and to strive to [words indistinct] chemical weapons as soon as possible.

For example, we have provided the means for verification personnel from the United States and other countries to visit the testing sites and to gain understanding of the models of Soviet chemical weapons. We also have offered data on the exact quantities of these weapons to our counterparts in talks. The Soviet Union has unilaterally announced the discontinuation of the production of chemical weapons. Our country is even prepared to destroy such weapons.

We should point out the proposal presented a few days ago by Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze at the 44th Session of the UN General Assembly. He urged the United States to follow the example of the Soviet Union and to thoroughly stop the production of chemical weapons before the signing of an international convention. Shevardnadze proposed that the Soviet Union and the United States mutually reduce or completely destroy all of their stockpiled chemical weapons. The United States proposed that each of the two countries destroy 80 percent of its stockpiled chemical weapons.

Moscow TV Notes Worsening Drug Problem in PRC

LD0910183189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1535 GMT 9 Oct 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] Some 3 years ago when I was in Beijing I was shown a smallish alley in one of the central districts of the capital where there had one been numerous opium dens. At that time I was proudly told that an end had long been put to that and that there were no drugs problem in the country. But the situation is evidently changing, and quite quickly. In the first half of the present year alone the PRC public security forces intercepted 187 attempts to illegally transport drugs across the territory of China. In general terms, almost 300kg of opium and heroin were seized.

A spokesman of the Chinese bureau of Interpol has stated that China has recently been developing into a staging post for the international drugs mafia, and, as a direct consequence of this, there has been a sharp rise in drug addiction, especially among young people in the country's border regions. In his words, China is not yet ready to tackle this new problem in a fully armed way.

Lao-Chinese Statement on Normalization Issued

PM1210135089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "K. Phomvihan in Beijing"]

[Text] Beijing, 10 Oct—China and Laos express mutual satisfaction with the normalization and development of links between the two countries' parties. This was stated by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, and K. Phomvihan, general secretary of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party and chairman of the Lao Council of Ministers.

Normalization of Relations Viewed

OW1310053389 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] Dear listeners, the visit to China by Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, led to the normalization and development of relations between the two countries. The leaders of Laos and China inked four cooperation pacts in culture, consular activities, and other fields. Of the event, our station commentator Melnichenko writes as follows:

The process of normalizing relations between Laos and China began 2 years ago after they signed accords on economic issues and barter and border trade protocols. Restoring relations between the two parties led to the normalization of relations between the two countries. It

was very apparent that the news was welcome by the people of the two countries and their neighboring countries as well as other countries. Real peace-loving people cannot but be happy at the establishment of good-neighborly relations among neighboring countries. It should be pointed out that the normalization of relations between Laos and China is merely a link in the whole chain of restoring friendly relations between China and other socialist countries. Starting in the 1970s, China restored relations one by one with the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia and increased its trade with those countries. Relations between China and those countries developed further in recent years. China signed trade agreements with many of those countries and trade volumes between them doubled. The leaders of a number of socialist countries in Europe made official visits to China and Chinese leaders also visited those countries in return during the past few years.

The most significant event in the course of China's normalizing its relations with other socialist countries took place in the spring of this year when Soviet Leader Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev visited China. World opinion holds that the total normalization of the relations between the Soviet Union and China is one of the major events in recent years. Their relations entered a new and supreme stage and opened up great possibilities for developing good-neighborly cooperation and relations between the two countries.

Sino-Mongolia relations were completely normalized this summer and now China also restored its ties with Laos. During Kaysone Phomvihan's China visit, Chinese leaders brought up their wishes for normalizing relations between China and Vietnam. As you all know, Vietnam has also made similar proposals. Therefore, there is hope for normalizing relations between these two socialist countries. That socialist countries are advancing their relations in a constructive way is a welcome sign and can only make people happy, because the outcome of this process will strengthen the socialist camp and foster peace and security in the world.

Northeast Asia

DPRK Issues Appeal to S. Koreans on Unification

PM1110155189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Oct 89 Morning Edition p5

[TASS report: "Support for Important Initiative"]

[Text] Pyongyang has published a letter from DPRK political parties and social organizations which contains an appeal to the South Korean authorities, political parties, and organizations to hold a joint conference at which it would be possible to consider the question of publishing an all-national declaration on the methods of unifying the country and discuss other constructive initiatives whose implementation would contribute to speeding up the peaceful reunification of Korea.

This new, important initiative is convincing evidence of the consistency and purposefulness of the DPRK's peace-loving course, the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries said in a statement. The Soviet participants in the Afro-Asian solidarity movement have stated their firm support for the DPRK's efforts to build a constructive dialogue between the north and south of the country for the sake of fulfilling the cherished dream of the Korean people of a united, prospering motherland. Eliminating the hotbed of tension on the Korean peninsula and implementing the independent, peaceful unification of Korea would be an epoch-making event for all peace-loving mankind.

The solidarity committee has appealed to realistic, sober-minded circles in South Korea and to all who hold dear the fate of the Korean people and the peaceful future of the whole Asian continent, to heed and support the constructive appeal made by Pyongyang.

USSR-DPRK Joint Programs, Enterprises Cited

SK1010050689 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 9 Oct 89

[Unattributed talk on friendly ties between the Soviet Union and Korea]

[Text] On 22 September, Comrade Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union [CPSU], met with Comrade Ho Tam, secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea [WPK].

Comrade Yakovlev explained to Comrade Ho Tam about reform works and political and economic programs carried out by the CPSU and exchanged views on the international situation.

Comrade Ho Tam pointed out the basic programs of the WPK for ensuring the economic development of the republic and for strengthening the ideological and political unity of the socialists.

Views on the development of the situation in Asia and on a series of other international problems were also exchanged.

Comrade Yang Hyong-sop, chairman of the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea [DPRK] and head of the parliamentary delegation of the DPRK, expressed support for the letter of appeal of the USSR Supreme Soviet sent to the U.S. Congress on the issue of banning nuclear explosions and nuclear tests and for the letter of the Soviet Assembly sent to the parliaments of various world nations on the issue of banning chemical weapons.

Comrade Yang Hyong-sop pointed out that these proposals are an expression of the consistent peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union.

We have already pointed out during our previous broadcast program that the first USSR-DPRK (?joint-venture) restaurant named "Pyongyang" had opened in Moscow. Before long, the residents of Pyongyang will be able to enjoy traditional Soviet food in the restaurant "Moscow" to open in the capital of the DPRK as a cooperative venture between the Soviet trading company (Noseretnam) and the Korean company (Mungap 888).

A Korean restaurant, "Moranbong," will also open in (Shitachia) in the East Siberia at the end of the year. This restaurant, built in traditional Korean style, will be located in the New Movie Hall in downtown. The "Moranbong" restaurant venture is the second USSR-DPRK joint enterprise in this city. The first joint-venture company "(Kisu)" has already won great popularity and has begun manufacturing products. This enterprise produces medicines from herbs.

Fur, Leather Joint Venture Set Up

LD1310085789 Moscow TASS in English 0600 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—Goods made of high-quality furs and leather will become staple commodities at the first Soviet-South Korean joint venture Jindo-Rus which opened here on Thursday.

The venture was founded by the South Korean Jindo Company, the American firm Berusa, and the Soviet Interlik enterprise.

They expect to make considerable profits due to foreign tourists' interest in fur goods made by the joint venture.

"The fur saloon which has opened at Moscow's Intourist Hotel is the first product of the Soviet-South Korean joint venture," Kim Yong-doo [name as received], president of the Jindo Company, told TASS.

"A similar saloon will open in Lvov soon and another several shops are expected to open in Moscow," he said.

"Jindo, the world's major producer of fur goods, possesses the most up-to-date technology for the dressing and treatment of furs.

"At first, Soviet raw furs will be treated at the plants of Jindo and other Western firms. Subsequently, the company is planning to deliver appropriate equipment to the Soviet Union and share its experience."

The company's president said he is confident of the commercial success of the joint venture, since more than two million tourists from developed capitalist countries visit the Soviet Union every year and will certainly take interest in Jindo goods. He said prices of goods will be quite moderate.

DPRK Premier Thanks Ryzhkov for Congratulations

PM0710144989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Message from DPRK Premier Yon Hyong-muk thanking N.I. Ryzhkov for congratulations on DPRK anniversary]

[Text] To Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

I express profound gratitude for the cordial congratulations which were sent by the USSR Council of Ministers on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the formation of the DPRK.

I take this opportunity to express confidence that the traditional bonds of friendship which link our countries' peoples will continue to strengthen, and to wish you even greater success in your responsible work.

Yon Hyong-muk, premier of the DPRK Administrative Council.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Defense Minister Cited on Situation

PM1210150189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Opposition Encounters Rebuff"]

[Text] Phnom Penh, 9 Oct—Virtually the entire territory of Cambodia is securely under the control of people's power, and armed opposition formations are not in a position to seize and hold significant areas, Cambodian National Defense Minister Tie Banh said at a press conference here. It dealt with the military situation in the country since the final withdrawal of the Vietnamese volunteers.

Tie Banh noted that recently the press in certain countries has been going on about the failure of the current Cambodian government, predicting its imminent fall as a result of defeat in the armed struggle against the opposition. There are fables about major military successes by the counterrevolution and its capture of important areas of the country. In fact, he said, this does not accord with reality.

Nevertheless, reactionary forces are continuing the course of kindling civil war in Cambodia. In particular, they are attempting to send their detachments over the Thai-Cambodian border, concentrate them in provinces surrounding Lake Tonle Sap, and block important lines of communication. The most complex situation at the moment, the minister noted, is in the vicinity of the border cities of Pailin and Sisophon, where the enemy has succeeded in capturing a number of hills and is trying to capture these population centers. But subunits of the

Cambodian People's Revolutionary Army, with the support of the self-defense forces, are repelling attacks by armed opposition detachments.

Cambodian Denial of SRV Troops' Capture Cited

PM0610155789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Cambodian Foreign Ministry Statement"]

[Text] Phnom Penh, 5 Oct—The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Cambodia has categorically rejected a statement by the Thai Foreign Ministry issued 3 October claiming that the Thai Armed Forces have captured a number of Vietnamese servicemen on Thai territory. A State of Cambodia Foreign Ministry statement published today emphasizes that the pullout of Vietnamese volunteer forces from Cambodian territory was completed 26 September and that not a single Vietnamese serviceman or military adviser remains in the country.

The Thai Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement can be described as a slanderous fabrication which was rejected even by the Thai military themselves. The State of Cambodia Foreign Ministry categorically rejects the calumnies spread by the Thai Foreign Ministry, which are a distortion of the real situation in Cambodia, and it demands that all hostile acts against the Cambodian people cease without delay. All foreign aid to Pol Pot's men and other Khmer reactionaries must be ended forthwith so as to prevent them from unleashing civil war in Cambodia which would have negative consequences for the cause of peace and stability in the region, the document stresses in conclusion.

Commentary Discusses 'Fresh Violence' in Cambodia

OW1310051089 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 6 Oct 89

[Trushin commentary: "On the Situation in Cambodia After the Withdrawal of Vietnamese Troops"]

[Text] Pol Pot's armed forces have escalated the fighting in northwestern Cambodia bordering on Thailand. Following the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, the Khmer Rouge has been attempting to penetrate the hinterland of the country. Station observer Trushin writes in this connection:

Regrettably, peace has not come to Cambodia. Since the last Vietnamese soldier withdrew from Cambodia on 26 September, armed clashes have taken place with fresh violence. This is more proof of the Khmer Rouge leaders' hypocrisy. They asserted that they fought against the presence of Vietnamese troops. Now that the Vietnamese troops have left Cambodia, Pol Pot elements are continuing fighting against their own people.

The situation in Cambodia has worsened. This has smashed the hope for a early peaceful life for the Cambodian people, who are weary of bloodshed. This has also caused concern among its neighboring countries about whether the regional conflict can be finally mediated and settled. Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines have shown concern over this. For example, while visiting West European countries, Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan repeatedly stated that the Cambodian war must be brought to an end as soon as possible in order to make Indochina a prosperous trade zone. During the Paris talks, he explained a plan for holding an unofficial Cambodian quadripartite meeting in Jakarta in November. Chatchai Chunhawan held that, during the meeting, an international supervisory mechanism might be set up to ensure a cease-fire in Cambodia, and preparations might be made for elections in the country. French President Mitterrand voiced support for any practical efforts to effect a relaxation of the situation in that region. Philippine Secretary of Foreign Affairs Manglapus said in New York that he supported the Thai proposal.

As you know, so many people are concerned about the cease-fire problem in Cambodia. Phnom Penh is prepared for a cease-fire, but the opposition has a different view. The increasing military activities by the Pol Pot elements have clearly borne out this point.

Petrovskiy Meets With SRV Counterpart in New York

PM1110103789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Useful Contacts in New York"]

[Text] New York, 6 Oct—V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, had a thorough and friendly conversation with Nguyen Dy Nien [second element of name as transliterated], SRV vice foreign minister, in which they touched on a broad range of questions under discussion at the 44th UN General Assembly session. Special attention was paid to various apsects of the problem of the Cambodian settlement and in particular to ways of achieving a settlement as soon as possible.

Vietnamese Delegation Studies Work of CPSU

PM0910163589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV], a delegation of CPV party workers headed by Phan Ziyen [second name as transliterated], deputy chief of the CPV Central Committee chancellery, visited the Soviet Union 27 September through 6 October to acquaint itself with the work experience of the CPSU Central Committee General Department and

other departments in conditions of perestroyka. The Vietnamese comrades visited Kazakhstan, where they were received at the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee.

Near East & South Asia

Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Algeria

Pallayev, Delegation Arrive

LD0510153189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2008 GMT 4 Oct 89

[Text] Algiers—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet headed by G. Pallayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet presidium arrived in the Algerian capital today on an official visit at the invitation of the National People's Assembly of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic. The Soviet parliamentarians are informing their Algerian colleagues about the progress of perestroyka, the reform of the political system in the USSR, and the results of the first congress of people's deputies.

Meets President, Parliamentarians

PM1210102389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Delegation Reception"]

[Text] Algiers, 7 Oct—Algerian President Chadli Benjededi received a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, which is paying an official visit to Algeria, today. Delegation leader G. Pallayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, gave the head of the Algerian state a personal message from M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

On familiarizing himself with the document, C. Benjededi expressed gratitude for its warm words.

In the course of a conversation, which took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere, the Algerian president talked about Algeria's readiness to continue to develop and strengthen the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation that have taken shape between the two countries in all spheres. People in Algeria, he said, are following attentively the process of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and wish the friendly Soviet people success in their noble efforts to renew society. In the opinion of the Algerian leader, the reform processes taking place in the USSR and Algeria are similar in many respects.

Perestroyka, C. Benjededi said, is important not only for the peoples of the Soviet Union. It has assumed great international significance. The USSR's concept of the new political thinking has considerably facilitated a general improvement in the international situation and created favorable conditions for seeking ways to remove seats of tension and solve various regional conflicts. In this connection the Algerian president noted that Algeria supports the Soviet Union's efforts aimed at reducing nuclear arsenals, eliminating the threat of thermonuclear war, and strengthening peace and security throughout the world. He also gave a high assessment of the Soviet Union's firm and principled stance on a Near East settlement.

For his part, the head of the Soviet parliamentary delegation spoke about the radical changes taking place in the USSR and the efforts of the Soviet leadership and the people to implement profound transformations within the country. He stressed the Soviet Union's desire to strengthen friendly relations with Algeria in all spheres, fill them with new content, and raise them to a higher level. In this connection G. Pallayev expressed confidence that the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's current visit to Algeria would contribute to the development of bilateral ties between the peoples of both countries.

R. Bitat, chairman of the Algerian People's National Assembly, and V.N. Taratuta, USSR ambassador to Algeria, took part in the conversation.

Today the members of the Soviet parliamentary delegation met with R. Bitat and held talks with a delegation from the Algerian People's National Assembly headed by Djelloul Malaika, deputy president of the Algerian parliament. In the course of the conversations, which took place in a warm atmosphere, there was a thorough exchange of opinions on a broad range of questions linked with the activity of both countries' supreme legislative organs and the state of USSR-Algerian bilateral relations.

G. Pallayev pointed out that people in the Soviet Union follow with understanding and sympathy the processes of political, economic, and social reform in Algeria and wish the Algerian people success on this path.

In turn R. Bitat and D. Malaika informed the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation about the transformations in Algeria and the Algerian leadership's efforts to resolve the complex problems facing the country.

In the course of the talks the sides noted their mutual desire to develop Soviet-Algerian parliamentary ties both on a bilateral basis and at the level of the Interparliamentary Union.

The leader of the Soviet delegation invited an Algerian People's National Assembly delegation to visit the Soviet Union.

Discussions With Officials Summarized

PM1310083789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

["On the Visit by a USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by G. Pallayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, was in the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria [DPRA] 4-9 October at the invitation of the DPRA National People's Assembly.

The delegation included USSR People's Deputies V.A. Zalomay and A.D. Melikov.

The delegation was received by DPRA President Chadli Bendjedid, who was presented with a personal message from M.S. Gorbachev.

Conversations were held at the National People's Assembly with an Algerian delegation headed by Assembly Chairman Rabah Bitat. Meetings also took place with Abdelhamid Mehri, secretary general of the National Liberation Front Central Committee, and a number of members of the cabinet of ministers.

In the course of the visit the sides exchanged information on the activity of the two countries' parliaments and discussed topical problems of the international situation and questions of the further development of Soviet-Algerian relations.

The Algerian delegation described the work of the National People's Assembly, the reform of the political system now being implemented in the DPRA, and the important transformations aimed at boosting the national economy's efficiency.

The Soviet parliamentarians described the progress of perestroyka processes in the USSR and the implementation of profound democratic reform of the entire system of power and management, one of whose most important components is the restoration of full power of soviets at all levels. Special emphasis was placed on information about the results of the Congress of People's Deputies and the session of the newly convened USSR Supreme Soviet. Detailed explanations were provided on the way the concept of the new political thinking is making headway in the USSR's international activity.

A detailed and keen discussion of international problems revealed a high degree of mutual understanding on all questions raised. The Soviet and Algerian parliamentarians were unanimous in their understanding of the growing responsibility of parliaments for the future of the world and the reorganization of international relations on new foundations ensuring a transition from confrontation to dialogue and equal cooperation. They noted the need to consolidate and deepen positive changes in international life.

The fundamental interests of all countries and peoples demand the implementation of specific steps to create an all-embracing system of international security and achieve progress in the cause of reducing and ultimately eliminating nuclear arsenals and reducing conventional arms to a level of reasonable sufficiency.

The Algerian side expressed its high appraisal of the USSR's constructive initiatives aimed at ensuring real progress in the cause of disarmament for the sake of creating a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

The Soviet parliamentarians highly appraised the DPRA's important and constructive contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and international security and to the quest for political settlement of regional problems.

Problems of the development of "third world" countries have acquired universal importance. In this context, emphasis was placed on the need for perestroyka in international relations and a fair settlement of the problems of these countries' indebtedness.

Complete recovery in international relations also implies the untangling of numerous regional conflict situations. The Soviet and Algerian deputies spoke in favor of stepping up the efforts aimed at seeking an all-embracing settlement of the Near East problem and its core—the Palestinian question. Favorable prerequisites for positive progress in this direction are created by the peaceful Palestinian uprising in the occupied territories, the PLO's flexible and constructive stance, and the adoption of a common platform for a Near East settlement at the summit meeting in Casablanca. The sides are convinced that the convening of an international conference is the most effective instrument for a Near East settlement.

The Soviet and Algerian parliamentarians expressed profound concern over the continuing tragedy in Lebanon. The situation in this long-suffering country demands the adoption of immediate measures to cease the bloodshed and reach a political settlement of the Lebanese crisis.

The Soviet side expressed a positive appraisal of the efforts by Algeria and other Arab Maghreb countries aimed at consolidating stability in this region and establishing relations of good neighborliness and equal cooperation.

The delegations expressed satisfaction with the traditionally high standard of Soviet-Algerian relations, based on the principles of equality, mutual respect, friendship, and trust. Emphasis was placed on the reciprocal desire to further deepen mutually advantageous cooperation in various spheres for the benefit of the peoples of the USSR and the DPRA.

It was noted that this visit makes a fresh contribution to the strengthening of fruitful ties between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the DPRA National People's Assembly and to the cause of developing friendly Soviet-Algerian relations.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation expressed gratitude to the Algerian side for the warm reception and hospitality enjoyed by the Soviet representatives in Algeria and invited a deleg ion of the National People's Assembly to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union.

The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Delegation Ends Visit 9 Oct

LD0910221989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 9 Oct 89

[Text] The official visit to Algeria by the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet headed by Pallayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic, has finished. The delegation left Algeria today. In a declaration made before his departure from the Algerian capital, the head of the Soviet delegation noted that the main event during their stay was the reception of the Soviet delegation by Bendjedid, the republic's president. We conveyed to the head of the Algerian state a personal message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Comrade Pallayev said.

Current State of Mideast Diplomacy Described

PM1210111589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[A. Chistyakov article: "Near East: Agreement Through Dialogue"]

[Text] Recently the Near East settlement has increasingly been seen as one of the priority themes of international contacts contrary to the established opinion that it is "lagging behind" the peace processes in other trouble spots. This is seen primarily at talks between representatives of the sides directly involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict and also those who could help to settle it in one way or another. Furthermore, the most diverse forms of diplomatic dialogue are being brought into operation—bilateral and multilateral dialogue and dialogue at a high political level as well as at working and expert level. People's diplomacy is beginning to pay closer attention to the situation in this region.

The Near East was also on the agenda at the recent Soviet-U.S. talks in Wyoming. I recall here that a number of contemporary regional conflicts were resolved with the direct participation of the USSR and the United States and for that reason the general view favoring active support for all-embracing political solutions and an accord on the continuation of meetings among experts on regional themes, both of which were noted there, are encouraging.

The opening of the latest UN General Assembly session in New York, the 44th to date, is again being used for diplomatic contacts, and noticeably more actively than in past years. A "Near East section" is present in virtually every report issued on the results of the meetings there involving the leaders of foreign policy departments. In the Near East region itself diplomatic work is also clearly gathering momentum.

The present stage of active contacts in this sphere has its own history. The mass actions by the population on the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967 (the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip), actions which began in December 1987 and continue to this day, have not only highlighted the Palestinians' rejection of the occupation and thus their refusal to tolerate the status quo any further but also encouraged major moves by the PLO on questions of a Near East settlement and the solution of the Palestinian problem. The PLO put forward an initiative to recognize Israel and hold talks with it in the framework of an international conference, and the Palestinian leaders stated the PLO's readiness for dialogue with the Israeli Government. For its part, Tel Aviv, however, has yet to make an appropriate response: As before, it rejects the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and is avoiding talks with the PLO—either direct talks or at a conference. The idea that the PLO cannot be trusted is also much discussed.

Nevertheless, people in Israel are clearly becoming increasingly aware that these are not arguments but excuses, that such a position is indefensible, that it damages the country's prestige, and that the arguments used to justify it do not even convince Tel Aviv's allies.

As is well known, in 1986 Tel Aviv adopted a law banning contacts with the PLO. True, individual Israeli politicians do maintain such contacts while others state that they are necessary. Minister M. Shahal, for example, noted: "It is an illusion to believe that there can be any prospect of a solution to the dispute without the PLO." Predictions of public opinion trends show that an increasing number of people in Israel will tend toward a dialogue with the PLO, which is already favored by one-third of Israelis now. But the law is the law, as the saying goes, and the present Israeli leaders haven't the courage at present to reject it.

When Israel severed links with the occupied Palestinian territories last year, the Israeli Government, hoping to "resolve" the Palestinian problem at talks with Jordan, was stymied—it had no partner to hold talks with.

In Washington in April this year, Israeli Prime Minister Shamir expressed a number of ideas on the question of a Near East settlement, the central element of which was to hold elections on the West Bank and in Gaza. This idea subsequently became part of the "peace initiative" adopted by the Israeli Government and approved by the Knesset (parliament). The essence of the proposal is that the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza will elect Palestinian representatives for talks with Israel, in other words, circumventing the PLO.

Before the idea of elections was expressed by Shamir and turned into the official government position it was repeatedly put forward by a number of Israeli politicians, for instance Foreign Minister Arens, Defense Minister Rabin, and Finance Minister Peres.

A paradoxical situation has occurred. In the PLO Israel has a partner for dialogue. Recently Y. 'Arafat stated openly: "We are ready for dialogue with Israel with no preconditions on either side." But Israel, as though still

living in the gloomy past, is still looking for a partner. Meanwhile, among the Palestinians and in Israel one senses the growing dissatisfaction at the lack of a real move toward the beginning of the peace process, which is in no one's interests because it threatens an increase in tension and regional destabilization.

A possible solution to this problem has been suggested by Egypt. Through a delegation of U.S. Congressmen at the beginning of July and officially on 15 September, the Egyptians conveyed to Israel's leaders a list of specific proposals on the terms for the holding of elections on the occupied Palestinian territories together with a number of general principles of a Near East settlement. The Egyptian proposals envisage, in particular, that international observers be sent to the elections, that Israeli troops be withdrawn from the areas where they are held, that there be free election campaigning, and that the inhabitants of East Jerusalem take part in them.

It is proposed that UN Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, the principle "land in exchange for peace," guarantees of security for all the region's states, and the realization of the Palestinians' political rights be taken as the general political basis of the settlement. It is envisaged that the elections and the establishment of an interim status for the West Bank and Gaza should be followed by talks on a definitive settlement. At the same time the Egyptians initiated the organization of a Palestinian-Israeli dialogue in Cairo. According to press reports Mubarak's proposals envisage that Egypt together with representatives of the USSR and the United States will take part in the Cairo dialogue although that section of the proposals was not conveyed to the Israelis.

Since Israel has suggested the idea of holding elections and Egypt has responded with its proposals, everything hinges on Tel Aviv's answer. That answer is also awaited by the PLO leadership, for whom "dialogue with Israel is a strategy, not a political maneuver," as Y. 'Arafat pointed out recently. So far there has been no answer. In Israel, as always when important decisions are about to be taken, a fierce debate has flared up both between the main participants in the government coalition—the Likud bloc and the Labor Party—and within them, since they have both have their own hawks and doves. The view is being expressed that for Israel the participation of the inhabitants of East Jerusalem in the elections is unacceptable, even though East Jerusalem is part of the Palestinian territories occupied in 1967: There are also those who refuse to accept the "land in exchange for peace" formula, even though it is this very formula which forms the basis of resolution 242, which was also mentioned in the Israeli Government's "peace initiative."

Deputy Foreign Minister B. Netanyahu, a Likud representative, states that Israeli will not hold talks "either directly with the PLO, with PLO members, or with people nominated by the PLO." In his view, Mubarak's call for Palestinian-Israeli talks and the Egyptian President's "10 proposals" on the holding of elections on the occupied territories "torpedo our initiative, they do not promote it."

Logic here is clearly missing: The Israeli initiative will not stand on its own, it can only be supported by talks. But as is well known, talks are not held alone. Nor are they held with fictitious partners.

Defense Minister Rabin (Labor Party) stated in turn that he supports the Egyptian President's idea on direct talks (Palestinian-Israeli talks) but does not have the appropriate mandate from the government. In a clear attempt to find a solution to the question of the form of the Palestinian representation in a dialogue with Israel, Y. Rabin talked about the possibility of the inclusion in the Palestinian delegation of people deported by Israel or professors from the United States (Americans of Palestinian origin) who are members of the Palestine National Council. Both he and S. Peres, present leader of the Labor Party, regard Mubarak's proposals as a golden opportunity to open talks.

The conflicting opinions again brought the coalition government to the brink of a crisis, but a serious one this time, as they are saying. In Israel people have again begun talking about the likelihood of its collapse.

It is obvious that in the establishment of the peace process the question of Palestinian-Israeli dialogue is now in the forefront. USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's announcement of an offer of mediation—the organization of a meeting between representatives of the PLO and Israel on Soviet territory—made a great impact in this regard. The Soviet minister also recalled a proposal on consultations on Near East settlement questions among the five permanent members of the Security Council, which could begin at expert level. The inclusion in such consultations of the sides involved in the conflict could help the development of dialogue between them and the search for compromise solutions, particularly using the peace-making potential of the United Nations. A varied approach to the solution of the prevailing situation could in the very near future open the way to an all-embracing settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and to the convening of an international conference on the Near East for that purpose.

Sub-Saharan Africa

U.S. Attitude Toward Angola Viewed

PM1210134989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by A. Nikanorov: "United States-Angola: What Savimbi Was Told in Washington"]

[Text] Who could have supposed that the handshake exchanged between Angolan President Jose Eduardo dos Santos and Jonas Savimbi, leader of the antigovernment

National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA] grouping, after the signing in June in Gbadolite (Zaire) of the provisional ceasefire agreement, would be no more than a gesture of protocol? That the ceasefire would last just a few days? That Savimbi would not appear in late September at the latest meeting of African leaders who thought they had approached the solution of a protracted regional crisis? That the UNITA thugs would make several hundred attacks which have caused new casualties and new destruction? That instead of dialogue on African soil J. Savimbi would set off across the ocean with a new plan of his own for a settlement of the conflict?

Probably not everything proposed by Luanda is acceptable to Savimbi just as the plan he put forward does not delight the Luanda government. Moreover, it has indicated that Savimbi's "new initiatives" are essentially the same "settlement" plan which the Reagan administration once tried to impose on the People's Republic of Angola Government through blackmail, pressure, and interference in the republic's internal affairs.

You can understand the disquiet of Luanda which, according to Foreign Minister Pedro de Castro Van Dunem, has repeatedly been promised a normalization of diplomatic relations with Angola and an end to support for UNITA on condition that the Angolan Government agree to the withdrawal of the Cuban military contingent from the country. This agreement was received and to this day Angola and Cuba have scrupulously—even ahead of schedule—fulfilled the schedule of troop withdrawal agreed by the three sides (Angola, Cuba, and the Republic of South Africa). This has just been confirmed by Brazilian General Gomes, leader of the UN monitoring commission in Angola. But having arrived in New York Van Dunem warned that the withdrawal of Cuban troops could be suspended if the United States continues to render aid to the UNITA grouping. And that is precisely what was being sought during his visit to Washington by Savimbi, who wants to get a firmer hold on the stick in order to impose his will.

He met with U.S. President George Bush. Of course, it could not be expected that the head of the White House, who has frequently spoken in support of the leader of the antigovernment grouping, would renounce his protege. But international observers draw attention to the rather restrained reception of the guest from the African forests. The U.S. president, according to White House press secretary Marlin Fitzwater, stressed during the meeting that the United States "is continuing to support UNITA." But here he expressed himself in favor of "national conciliation" and insistently urged Savimbi to work with Zaire's President Mobutu Sese Seko and other leaders in the region to strengthen peace. The president also stated that the United States supports the ceasefire and direct talks with the Angolan leadership and eventually free and fair elections. "After his visit to the White House, where the rebel leader was subjected to gentle pressure from President Bush, Savimbi stated that he is filled with the desire to return to the conference table," was how THE WASHINGTON POST observer R. Pizr [name as published] commented on the meeting.

Let us recall that the Zairean president was the intermediary in the talks between the Angolan Government and the armed opposition. At the time, with the assistance of a large group of African leaders, the Gbadolite agreement was successfully achieved. Let us recall that Mobutu banned the transfer of U.S. weapons, shipments of which, according to recent evidence from THE WASHINGTON POST again, have reached $50 million, to the UNITA men across Zaire's territory. At the same time 36 congressmen have signed a letter addressed to dos Santos inviting him to visit Washington as soon as possible.

Evidently the combination of all these factors pushed the White House to make advances in its position. The road to dialogue seems to be open again. All the sides must now display restraint and patience and mutual respect to retain the new procedure for a peace settlement of regional conflicts which has begun to asserts itself in the international arena. Everyone would gain from that.

Somalia's 'Economic Difficulties' Assessed

EA1110182089 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 10 Oct 89

[Aleksandr Mikhaylov commentary; from "World Events Today']

Text] Somali businessmen have now been allowed to import essential commodities without letters of credit. These measures, which were announced by the minister of commerce of Somalia, mean that businessmen will be handling foreign exchange when conducting foreign trade, especially in essential commodities. Undoubtedly, this is a step which the government could not have done without. The minister himself told journalists that the amount of food the country needs to import annually is estimated at 1,400,000 tonnes. Over the last 3 months, the country imported just 115,000 tonnes of food. If buying had continued at this level, the country would not have been able to import even half of its food requirement.

In light of this, one need not have much knowledge to appreciate the current economic difficulties which Somalia is experiencing. One can also imagine the current level of commodity prices in Somalia. For example, the price of rice has doubled over the last month. One kilogram of sugar now costs 1,000 Somali shillings, while workers' salaries vary from 3,000 to 4,000 shillings [as heard].

The Government of Somalia is searching for ways out of the crisis, which has been caused by debt. They are attracting foreign capital and, as is clear from this last decree, placing foreign exchange into the hands of the country's people.

However, the government has problems. The country's debt has to be serviced. Every year the government has to pay out $100 million which is an indication of the large amount of the debt. This money exceeds the revenue which the country earns from its exports, and the quantity of commodities exported by Somalia is falling because of the civil war in the country, which has recently intensified.

The fighting in Somalia has scared off most of the foreigners who sought to invest in the country. In addition, it is unlikely that the handling of foreign exchange to import commodities, by the people, will help very much. The quantity of imported commodities will increase, but the question is: Will their prices be reduced? With the increased supply of commodities will come corruption. The circulation of foreign exchange, which has not been working up until now, will increase, but money, which has been acquired illegally, will now be legalized.

The current economic situation in Somalia reminds us of a cycle in which solving one problem creates others, the solving of which are obstructed by the solutions to previous problems. Escaping such a cycle is not easy. It requires the introduction of many measures inside the country, in addition to external help. Nevertheless, it is crystal clear that in moving beyond the current economic crisis, Somalia's first priority should be to solve the country's political problems. For as long as civil war continues in the country, the very best efforts to remedy the country's economic problems will only provide short-term relief.

Commentary on Drought in Northern Ethiopia

EA1210114289 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 10 Oct 89

[Text] News agencies have widely reported that a vast specter of starvation is looming over the northern regions of Ethiopia, apparently due to drought. We now present a commentary by Vladimir Borisov:

Foreign journalists who recently visited the Eritrea and Tigray regions have given shocking eyewitness accounts: parched farmland, dried up seedlings, and untilled land are very sad sights in the area. The people have no food left. For many Eritreans food is a big problem today. Since June the price of wheat has tripled, while the price of cattle decreased from 800 or 1,000 birr to 300 birr a head. There is no grass or hay, so the cattle also face starvation, which is why the people are selling them off quickly.

According to an AFP reporter, the only hope for many northern Ethiopians of staying alive is the aid agencies. Many people sadly remember the shocking death by starvation of thousands of Ethiopians in 1984 and 1985. Ethiopians also recall the help they got from aid agencies and the international community. At the time, a number of international humanitarian and religious aid agencies sent life-saving food aid to the famine victims in Ethiopia. Food aid from the United States and Australia was dropped by Soviet helicopters in remote areas. Such cooperation between countries with diverse policies and religious beliefs to help a single African country, Ethiopia, was very praiseworthy. Now that the international situation is very suitable for cooperation and joint undertakings, we believe there are sufficient time and resources to solve the problem.

Of course, we should not neglect the time factor. The World Food Program representative in Ethiopia, David Morton, said a rapid and concerted international aid operation was needed to contain the vast specter of starvation looming over northern Ethiopia. For it to be effective, the operation must be undertaken within 6 months. This statement should be noted. The fact that there has been no official statement on the drought and the areas affected by it has exacerbated the problem. Both the Ethiopian Government and the opposition factions want to contain the grave effects of the drought. As is known, the Eritrean Region has been a battlefield for many years. Of course, this is a topic for discussion in its own right, but if the issue of the drought victims is ignored by any of the parties, history will hold them responsible.

The delegates to the forthcoming first round of talks between the Ethiopian Government and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, who will meet on 18 November in Nairobi, should not forget the fate of their 2 million drought-victim compatriots. Only with peace and stability will it be possible to contain the present starvation and guarantee that it does not recur.

East Europe

Polish Request for Katyn Investigation Noted

LD1310083889 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] In Poland, the procurator general has formally asked the Soviet Union to investigate the killings of 15,000 Polish officers at Katyn and other sites during World War II. In a communique addressed to his Soviet counterpart, the procurator general said the Katyn crime had the feature of homicide and was not subject to exploration.

The official explanation provided by Stalin at the time was that Polish officers had been killed by the Nazis, but many Polish historians believe the mass killings were carried out by Soviet security forces in 1940 on orders from Stalin.

A joint Soviet-Polish committee was set up in 1987 to investigate the matter, but so far there was no official report from the committee.

Further Reportage on Visit by Poland's Rakowski

Report on Address to Newsmen

PM1210121989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Departure from Moscow"]

[Text] Speaking at a meeting with journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center [on 11 October], M. Rakowski declared that he is satisfied with the visit's results and expressed the hope that the friendly relations existing between the two countries will develop and deepen. As regards ties between the CPSU and the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR], he emphasized, they need to be intensified, and it is necessary to develop already existing forms of cooperation and to seek new ones.

The PZPR, proceeding primarily from the people's interests, the first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee went on to say, supports T. Mazowiecki's government in all its actions aimed at leading Poland out of the economic crisis.

Speaking of the PZPR's future, M. Rakowski declared that, in his opinion, the party's program and its name ought to be changed at its upcoming congress. Appraising the changes occurring within the PZPR, he noted that their essence boils down to a retreat from communist concepts which emerged in the twenties and thirties and were based on the Third International's ideas.

Replying to a question about Poland's membership of the Warsaw Pact Organization, the first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee emphasized that the country's participation in the Warsaw Pact Organization is necessary today. But he did not rule out the possibility that future generations of Poles might have their own viewpoint on this issue.

Interview on Relations

LD1210213389 Moscow International Service in Polish 1400 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Mieczyslaw Rakowski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee, has paid a working visit to Moscow. During a press conference he said:

[Begin Rakowski recording] I would like at the outset to share my observations concerning my visit to Moscow today. It is obviously a working visit. It was preceeded last month by a (?long) talk with Mikhail Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet state and the CPSU; thus, to all intents and purposes, today's visit, today's talk, was a continuation of those talks which I have already held as first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee. But obviously, today I was in possession of a greater amount of experiences, although hardly 2 months since the changes [word indistinct] in Poland if one is talking about the alignment of political forces. Thus I was able to inform my interlocutor about the first conclusions pertaining to that situation. Above all, it ought to be stressed that my interlocutor showed full understanding for that situation which arose in Poland; and not just that—he quite simply wants to understand the situation, and that is why he also listens intently to what we have to say. As a very good friend of Poland, as the creator of perestroyka, he is a person who shows full understanding for the particular situation, and I would like to say he is a person who agrees with the line which we have chosen.

Comrade Gorbachev expressed full approval for our policy with regard to the government of Mazowiecki, which is based on our putting the nation's interests above all else. In connection with this we are supporting the Mazowiecki government in all measures aimed at getting Poland out of the economic crisis.

On Polish-Soviet relations, we are giving all our experience and friendly relations with the CPSU and the Soviet Union [word indistinct], if one can define it thus, to that superior matter, as is the nation's interest. We consider that also in the future, thanks to the goodwill of the Soviet leadership, we shall develop and deepen our relations and submit them precisely to the cause of getting Poland out of the crisis. [end recording]

[Announcer] Next, Mieczyslaw Rakowski replied to correspondents' questions. One of them was about how the new alignment of political forces would (?influence) the development of Soviet-Polish relations.

[Begin Rakowski recording] Well, the leadership of the Mazowiecki government publicly declares full readiness to fulfill all those obligations which the previous governments signed and took on in the sphere of relations with the Soviet Union. In reference to this, if those obligations are going to be fulfilled, there is no doubt that Polish-Soviet relations will remain at the same level as in the past. Obviously it can be said that for the Soviet comrades this is a new situation, but that will not impede them carrying out a policy by Moscow toward Poland based on those principles which have been in force up until now. In any case, I heard from Mikhail Gorbachev that the Soviet Union would remain loyal to these obligations, and it would abide by them.

I think that Polish-Soviet relations ought to be excluded to some degree, how can I put it, from party relations. In the sense that they have a general national meaning and regardless of the fact of who is premier or also who is in office, relations with the Soviet Union ought to remain at the center of attention if someone thinks in the categories of national interests.

I would like to draw attention to the fact that for the past 45 years our eastern border, for the first time in several hundred years, has not been a border on which any kind of fires of unrest would burn. In my opinion, anyone who wanted to incite unrest on that border would be comitting suicide. Historians will be able to make various

judgements on the ideological and political formation to which I belong, namely the Polish left. But they won't deny us one thing—they cannot deny precisely that we contributed to such a border. That is a historical achievement from the point of view of national interests, of national security. That is why I am adherent of the closest possible cooperation with the Soviet Union. [end recording]

[Announcer] One of the questions dealt with the development of inter-party contacts.

[Begin Rakowski recording] (?What concerns) inter-party relations—it is an obvious thing—is that they can in no way have a negative infuence on interstate relations. The latter can be divided up into, let's say, several such sectors. There is no doubt that basing ourselves on the relations, we are going to strive for all the state obligations, both in the economic, political, and cultural spheres, to be fulfilled by the government. That attitude is a (?way through) inter-party relations. Now, if it is a question of the quality of these relations, we have acknowledged that the relations should be intensified, the various forms of cooperation already in existence should be developed, or new ones found. And perhaps I'll say something banal, but it is obvious that for the CPSU, for my interlocutor, the political force which is closest to him is the PZPR. It is an obvious thing that the Soviet state, the Soviet Government, is going to approach state relations with complete good will, but it is a natural thing that its main affection is given to the Polish party as it is the closest to them from the point of view of joint aims. [end recording]

[Announcer] We are citing one more question which was asked: How and in what way can the party, in its present state, support the government of Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki, and wouldn't it be more ethical to go over to the constructive opposition?

[Begin Rakowski recording] Our party still forms a very important force on the political map of Poland. The standpoint which we hold or will hold toward the government's economic policy is not without significance, whether we call for support for that policy or not. It is also not without significance that those [word indistinct] 6,000 of good personnel—I stress good personnel—are members of the PZPR. [word indistinct] many possibilities (?in the sense) of giving support. And to the question of would it be more ethical: Give us a chance, after all that government has hardly been in office a month. We are quite simply, creating a new political alignment; new, I would say, habits are coming into existence on the political scene. We are looking for new forms of joint action with the former opposition. We are removing certain barriers which have come between us over the years. I wouldn't think about what is more ethical today—to be in the opposition or whether to also cooperate. Apart from that, it is a very simple thing: The opposition itself, or the former opposition—our present partners—is not able to achieve those aims toward which Poland ought to strive without the support of the PZPR. It is not a propaganda slogan that there are two main political forces in Poland, that none of these forces on its own can solve the basic problems; it's a fact. [end recording]

Hager Visits Moscow; Remarks on GDR Issues

Says 'No Divisions' in Leadership

LD1210161989 Hamburg DPA in German 1513 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—According to Kurt Hager, Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Politburo member and chief ideologue, there are no divisions within the GDR state and party leadership. "It is a united leadership and will remain so even if there are constant attempts to invent differences," Hager stated at the opening of the GDR Culture Days in Moscow today. He also announced a continuation in the dialogue with social forces and mentioned the churches in the GDR as interlocutors.

"If the interlocutors are willing and well-meaning, we can have a good discussion," Hager said, as head of a GDR delegation in Moscow, in an interview with Second German Television, to which DPA had access. "However if they want to call our social order into question, there is no basis for discussion." However, one cannot say "from one day to another" who the next interlocutor would be.

Hager said he regretted the mass exodus by tens of thousands of GDR citizens over the past few weeks, blaming the "propaganda" from the Federal Republic for contributing to "many having false expectations." The reasons existing in the GDR for the exodus "basically do not justify them leaving their homes," Hager said. "Do not forget there are still enough citizens in the GDR who are building up the country and who have the will to strengthen socialism in the GDR."

On the question of possible political changes in the GDR, the Politburo member pointed to yesterday's statement by the SED Politburo. Announcements were already made on this. "Now it is a matter of the details, these will come over the next few weeks and months," he added. He stated: "There are enough people, with whom the dialogue can and will now be held on further developments."

Comments on Future of Socialism

LD1310142189 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Berlin October 13 TASS—"Socialism in the German Democratic Republic will continue to gain strength. Contrary to all the forecasts of Western information organs, speculating on socialism's 'fiasco', it will grow more and more streamlined", GDR Socialist Unity Party Politburo member Kurt Hager said in an interview with GDR television while in Moscow.

"Socialism," Kurt Hager continued, "will make better headway if we exert joint efforts to resolve problems of the people's life and of social development in general. This is pointed out clearly in the statement issued by the Politburo of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. The party's 12th congress will discuss social problems in great detail."

Kurt Hager believes that every opportunity will be created for all parties of the bloc, for all public organisations and people of different walks of life to express their views on SUPG proposals.

The secretary of the SUPG Central Committee further stressed that every step should be weighed and carefully prepared. "The point in question is to meet the will of the people, improve their living standards and do everything in our power to safeguard peace".

Many people no longer speak on this problem, but peace remains the main topic of our times. "It is also linked with the consolidation of the German Democratic Republic, and by strengthening it we have, in fact, produced a fusion of socialism, peace, democracy and freedom mentioned in the Politburo statement".

Hungary Condemns 1968 Move Into CSSR

PM1310075589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Unidentified press agency report under the rubric "Abroad": "Hungarian Parliament Condemns"]

[Text] The Hungarian parliament has condemned the "decision by which Hungarian military units were sent illegally into the CSSR in 1968." The Hungarian defense minister stated in parliament that the "Brezhnev doctrine" "has been left behind in the past forever." He rejected the possibility of military intervention against Hungary on the part of any of its allies.

Reportage on New Hungarian Party's Congress

'Heated Debates' Noted

PM1110081589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS correspondents S. Ivanov, A. Smirnov, A. Kuklin, and A. Saliyev dispatch: "New Party Set Up in Hungary"]

[Text] Budapest, 9 Oct—The last few nonworking days can quite rightly be described as historic, TASS correspondents report from Budapest. A renewed Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] or a new party? Deputies gave an unequivocal answer to this question on the evening of 7 October at 2024 hours.

A group of congress delegates representing the platform of the Union of Supporters of Reforms and the People's Democratic Platform submitted a proposal to adopt a resolution on the nature of the party. According to this document, the era of the MSZMP in the country's history has ended and the history of the MSZMP as the state party has come to an end. The new party must dissociate itself from the crimes and mistaken ideas and methods, break with the system of a bureaucratic party state and the principle of democratic centralism, and strive for close and organic ties with the leftist East European parties advocating reforms.

Preserving juridical continuity, it was proposed that the congress announce the creation of a new party.

R. Nyers appealed to congress delegates, urging them to accept this proposal. Inter alia, he said that he deems this an acceptable compromise, which will provide an opportunity to revive the party and serve to create a new-style party, a new leftist socialist party, thus ensuring that it dissociates itself from Stalinism and the mistakes of the past and at the same time is the heir to the MSZMP's progressive reformist aspirations. This is the political essence of relations between the old and new parties. The creation of a new party, R. Nyers went on to indicate, is of great significance for Hungarian democracy, constitutionalism, and the continuity of socialism. Sound, socialist democracy is impossible in Hungary without the socialist movement and without the socialist party. Anyone who wants the socialist movement to fall to pieces after the MSZMP does not serve democracy. The creation of a new party is a progressive and historic step that must be wholeheartedly supported by every socialist.

Then the congress delegates—there were 1,202 delegates in the hall for the voting—adopted the "Congress Resolution on the Hungarian Socialist Party" by an overwhelming majority with 159 against and 38 abstentions. Thus a new party, the heir of the MSZMP, was founded—the Hungarian Socialist Party.

The forum described as the MSZMP congress continued its work Sunday morning as the Hungarian Socialist Party Congress. By an absolute majority the congress delegates adopted a decision for every participant in the forum to voice his proposals regarding the party's draft program statement in written form.

Heated disputes are not only raging in the forum's conference hall but also behind the scenes. The congress is receiving letters and cables from party members, expressing most opposing opinions. There are those who are glad at the creation of a new party and support it, but there are also people who deny its existence and say that the MSZMP, which was not juridically disbanded, has been retained.

R. Ribanszki, leader of the best-known group in the MSZMP's United Marxist Platform, said in an interview with TASS correspondents that the supporters of his platform want to urge MSZMP members not to join the new party but continue the struggle to renew the MSZMP from reform positions, retaining the party's name. The congress delegates did not have a mandate to create a new party. This morning we wanted to disband

our platform but then we decided to continue our activity since new associations are being created at the congress every day and we cannot stop work in that situation, he said.

Today, on the 4th day of the congress' work, the delegates adopted the Hungarian Socialist Party's statute and program statement. The document "Lessons of Hungary's Historical Development" was taken into consideration.

Congress Ends 10 Oct

PM1110100089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS, PRAVDA own correspondents V. Gerasimov, S. Ivanov report: "Results Will Have To Be Studied"]

[Text] Budapest, 10 Oct—To form a party that will be capable of standing its ground in the political arena of a multiparty rule-of-law state and will implement the ideas of socialism in a new way on the basis of pluralism of opinion, broad democracy, and a market economy with mixed ownership, departing from the old model, administrative methods, and the command style—that was the aim of the Hungarian Socialist Party Congress, which has just ended.

The Hungarian Socialist Party statutes were adopted Monday, after a stormy debate. In accordance with the statutes the new party is a political organization, Marxist in spirit, adopting the universal values of human progress, humanism, freedom, and democracy, continuing the time-tested traditions of the socialist and communist movement, and committed to solidarity and the principle of social justice and respect for creative labor. The party draws on the historic traditions and values of the Hungarians and is an heir of the best aspirations of the Hungarian progressive movement and the ideas of service to the Fatherland and to progress. Through its activity it intends to serve the entire nation. It is a party of people who live on the income from their own labor, but also a party of entrepreneurs.

The congress also adopted the Hungarian Socialist Party program statement, which stresses that unhampered, balanced relations with the USSR were and are in Hungary's national interest. Hungary seeks to ensure that its international ties develop on the basis of voluntary and equal cooperation between states freely choosing their social system.

The Hungarian Socialist Party supports any political step aimed at strengthening the detente process in Europe. The aim is to eliminate NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization this century. Hungary considers it necessary to make amendments to the Warsaw Pact doctrine and reinforce its defensive character. Membership of an alliance system should not be grounds for interference in states' internal affairs.

The party's main aim, the document says, is democratic socialism, which the Hungarian Socialist Party seeks to achieve by peaceful, people's democratic means. The party seeks to ensure the socialist nature of the social system primarily through the free development of the individual and of collectives. The party dissociates itself from all versions of Stalinism and neo-Stalinism.

As already reported, Rezso Nyers was elected chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Party—86 percent of delegates voted for him.

In a statement for the Hungarian mass media he stressed that it was a difficult congress. In the course of preparations for the forum, there was tension in the party, the apparatus, and the leadership. Judging from the results, the congress can be assessed positively. But it did not pass as smoothly as may appear from outside. A significant proportion of party members have developed a sense of uncertainty about the congress, because they do not clearly understand what happened and why. The Hungarian Socialist Party, R. Nyers stated, is not a communist party in the old sense of the word, and not a social democratic party. It is a socialist party which develops social democratic and communist values. The Hungarian Socialist Party is open to the 720,000 members of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP]. The party chairman expressed the conviction that the majority of MSZMP members will accept the Hungarian Socialist Party.

The delegates also adopted a resolution about 1956. Guided by the idea of national reconciliation, the congress proposed that the party's parliamentary group put forward an initiative to declare 23 October a national memorial day.

R. Nyers proposed that I. Pozsgay be nominated for the post of president of the republic from the Hungarian Socialist Party (direct elections are to be held soon). Incidentally, the present head of the Hungarian government, M. Nemeth, is also a member of the Hungarian Socialist Party Presidium.

At 0130 hours on 10 October, the national anthem rang out in the auditorium, followed by the "Internationale." The new party's congress had finished. The course is formulated, but many problems remain to be resolved.

Congress Not 'Purely Cosmetic'

PM1110142189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Special correspondents F. Lukyanov and B. Rodionov dispatch: "Not Just a Change of Banner. The Hungarian Socialist Party Congress Ends Its Work"]

[Text] Budapest—The extraordinary congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], which was transformed into the constituent congress of the Hungarian Socialist Party, ended its work with the

singing of the "Internationale" late in the night of 9-10 October. It adopted the new party's program declaration and statute.

The radical reformers, who came together first in study circles and later in the league of reforms, attained their basic goal—to change the party's nature. The contradictions which had gradually built up over the last few years now produced a transition to a new qualitative state. Instead of communist, the party became socialist not only in name but also in essence; from a party of the workers it transformed itself into the party of "people enjoying labor incomes and small-scale entrepreneurs"—this is what the resolution proclaiming the Hungarian Socialist Party says. All this should guarantee the party a better starting position in the election campaign struggle.

The program documents no longer mention Marxism-Leninism. The party has also abandoned the traditional principle of democratic centralism and has proclaimed itself a free and voluntary union of currents.

As regards the new party's international orientation, the resolution on the creation of the Hungarian Socialist Party offers the following, somewhat vague, formulation: The Hungarian Socialist Party "desires to maintain close and organic ties with left-wing parties in Central and East Europe striving for reforms, as well as with reformist-communist, socialist, and social democratic parties all over the world." The Hungarian Socialist Party's program declaration states that the Soviet Union is a reliable partner and ally of Hungarian renewal. The congress backed a proposal for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary as a component of the process of disarmament and withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of European states.

The party's goal has been proclaimed as a peaceful transition "from dictatorial state socialism to democratic socialism based on market economics." Emphasis is placed on pluralism of forms of ownership, including private ownership.

And so, matters were certainly not limited to a change of banner, a purely cosmetic operation. The party has indeed changed its nature, even though it has proclaimed itself to be the heir of "the time-tested traditions of both the socialist and the communist movements." Party Chairman R. Nyers explained that the Hungarian Socialist Party is not a social-democratic party.

Ninety percent of congress delegates voted for such a party. Different groupings and currents reached a compromise in order to preserve the party as an influential force in the conditions of a multiparty system and to prevent its disintegration into numerous hostile sects. A special role in this was played by R. Nyers, who upheld the right of every MSZMP member to register as a member of the new party, avoiding a degrading and possibly biased purge procedure. Now the Hungarian Socialist Party has to solve a difficult task: How to reconcile its proclaimed freedom of currents and platforms within the party with unity of actions.

In the opinion of many delegates, a considerable role was played at the congress by backstage talks and conferences between platforms and currents, which in some ways supplanted the functions of the congress itself. No wonder that delegates welcomed with such approval the proposal that the four most prominent party leaders be heard at a closed sitting to explain their personal stance prior to the election of leadership organs. Following the presentation of their explanations, they all won a vote of confidence. R. Nyers was elected party chairman almost unanimously. A Hungarian Socialist Party Presidium of 24 members was also elected, as were other leadership organs. I. Poszgay, leader of the radical reformers, was confirmed as Hungarian Socialist Party candidate for the office of president of the republic.

Nyers on Distinctions Between Old, New Party

PM1310105189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Structure of the Hungarian Socialist Party"]

[Text] Budapest, 12 Oct—The number of members of the new Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP] will depend on how successful its political work is conducted, Rezso Nyers, MSZP chairman, stated on Hungarian Television Wednesday. Clearly one can count on 50-70 percent of the membership of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP]. Those who disagree with the MSZP's program will become nonparty because the MSZMP has ceased to exist. But if some people insist on continuing the MSZMP's activity, R. Nyers pointed out, that would create a complex legal situation. From the political viewpoint everything is simple: Those who share the MSZMP's views and believe that it is necessary to adhere to them in the future must found a new party similar to the MSZMP.

The political difference between the MSZMP and the MSZP is very great. If you study the MSZP's program you will notice that it enshrines the democratization of the foundations of a party which has a completely different structure. It is oriented not toward the top but the grass roots and is preparing for activity in conditions of the multiparty system and parliamentary democracy. It is a party which will be organized primarily in local neighborhoods.

A spirit of coalition is present to some extent within the MSZP. However, the range of directions in it is not as broad as before. That is to say, the extreme wings have gone, and it may be said that there has not been a split within the party but a break away from it.

The formation of the new party means radical changes because the old policy cannot continue this program and these statutes.

The MSZP is close to such Western parties as the Italian Communist Party and the Communist Party of Finland as well as the Austrian and Swedish Socialist Parties and the Social Democratic Party of Germany. We are trying to borrow something from each of them while remaining a Hungarian party at the same time.

At present there is no communist party in Hungary although there are communists. We in the MSZP recognize the reform-minded communists who form an organic part of it. But there are also "traditional" communists who want to continue the old communist policy in the future, too. There is no place for them in the MSZP because that is incompatible with its political viewpoint. Clearly those communists can form a new organization.

Hungarian Party Metamorphosis Viewed

PM1110145389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 89 p 3

[Own correspondent A. Kaverznev dispatch under the "Budapest on the Line" rubric: "'What Remains in Force?' That Was the Main Question Raised By Delegates From the Rostrum of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Congress"]

[Text] The newspaper, NEPSZABADSAG, titled one of its reports on the work of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] Congress thus: "Backstage Congress." In actual fact, one could not help but see in the "Budapest" Palace of Congresses that only some delegates were present in the hall. People were constantly going out to the foyer, assembling in groups, and discussing things. Conferences of delegate groups were called during recesses, and these discussions were sometimes more trenchant than at the plenary sessions.

At the very outset of the congress there were seven platforms formed. Then ten. As we have already reported, the radical platform, the Union of supporters of reforms, was the most numerous. Its representatives also seized the emotional leadership of the congress. It was followed by adherents of the people's democratic platform, which is close to the reformers. The main decision made by the congress—the creation of the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP]—arose as a result of the alliance of these two platforms plus the youth, agrarian-food, and "equal chances for the provinces" platforms which joined them.

Virtually all delegates appreciated the need for the MSZMP to be radically renewed. Everyone advocated reforms. But the depth and radicalness of them was assessed differently. Some delegates like, for example, MSZMP General Secretary Karoly Grosz, who delivered the Central Committee report, were prepared to limit themselves to renewing the existing MSZMP. Others proposed setting up a new socialist party which would become the MSZMP's successor. After the first day of congress work representatives of the Union of supporters of reforms assembled for a conference in the evening. Adherents of the other platforms were invited. The framework and content of possible cooperation were defined. Conference participants advocated setting up a new socialist party which would continue the democratic traditions of the Hungarian Left and in alliance with other parties act in the interests of national renewal. The next morning, that is to say, Saturday, all delegates were acquainted with the proposals made and discussion began. A draft resolution on the nature of the party was drawn up on the basis of its results. It was adopted in the evening by an overwhelming majority of votes in favor with 159 cast against and 38 abstentions. At 2022, when the computer gave the results of the vote, the chairman announced the creation of the MSZP.

What is the point in creating the new party? The point, in the opinion of its initiators, is that by dissociating itself from the MSZMP's mistakes and the crimes perpetrated in Hungary's postwar history and renouncing the ideology of the dictatorship of the proletariat, democratic centralism, and the leading role in society the party will be able to secure success at the upcoming presidential and parliamentary elections.

The final version of the "Congress Resolution on the Hungarian Socialist Party" says that the concept of socialism that has existed until the present time, the system of Stalinism, has exhausted all social, economic, political, and moral reserves and is unable to keep pace with world development. Thus ended the history of the MSZMP as a state party.

The MSZP will be supported by a broader social base. It considers itself the party of working people, small businessmen, and citizens of Hungarian and other nationalities. The MSZP's basic principles include tolerance of philosophical and political views and the free and voluntary alliance of tendencies. It will seek to create a socialist market economy with mixed ownership. Its political goal is a multiparty parliamentary democracy based on a system of self-management. In the international arena the MSZP will seek to maintain close and organic contacts with the reformist, left-wing parties of East Europe and communist, socialist, and social democratic parties of the world.

Membership of the MSZMP does not signify in any way automatic entry to the new party. A lot of complicated organizational work lies ahead. MSZMP members who wish to join the new party have to confirm their decision in writing by 31 October. The only thing is will they all want to join the MSZP?

Karoly Grosz, for example, and Janos Berecz, former member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee who has recently headed the platform, "Rally for the MSZMP," have stated their unwillingness to join the new party.

"I do not want to compromise it," said Berecz, who wishes to remain a Communist.

On Sunday evening journalists were unexpectedly addressed at the press center by Robert Ribanszki, former secretary to Janos Kadar and leader of the United Marxist platform. He stated that the little over 1,000 congress delegates do not reflect the opinion of all 710,000 party members and that the delegates have no mandates to dissolve the MSZMP and create the MSZP.

"The MSZMP will continue to operate until at least 31 October," he said. "We will be analyzing the current situation and putting forward a program for the renewal of the MSZMP. I think that we will be supported. The MSZMP has a wealth of traditions, particularly as most party members were not implicated in the mistakes of the past. They were committed by individual leaders and experts whose opinion they respected."

At the congress Ribanszki and his supporters were in a clear minority. But the first reaction of ordinary party members to the news of the MSZP's creation was mixed. Some rapturously welcome the event, others respond to it with distrust, dissatisfaction, and even fury. Janos Barabas, who each evening described to journalists that day's congress proceedings, expressed the opinion that party members should properly consider once again the results of the congress before drawing their conclusions.

There is nothing surprising perhaps in the fact that the compromise reached among the platforms literally the next day, Sunday, should be criticized from not only the left but the right. Peter Medgyessy, deputy chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, said notably that the principal bases of the compromise drawn up by congress was not clearly defined enough and was therefore unconvincing. And he personally had still not decided whether to join the MSZP. Other speakers tried to get guarantees that the creation of the MSZP does actually mean a new party and not simply a different label.

On Monday congress delegates adopted the MSZP Statutes and a program statement. The document "Lessons of Hungary's Historical Development " was taken note of. Rezso Nyers became MSZP chairman.

The congress ended and it will undoubtedly go down in history not as a backstage congress but as a milestone in the history of the Hungarian left. The party split, which many forecast, did not happen at the congress. But a definitive regrouping of the forces of the left clearly did not occur either. The next few weeks will show whether the new leadership of the new party will be able to rally the majority around it and whether the MSZP will become a true alliance of fellow-thinkers ready to fight for the renewal of Hungary in the new aconditions.

Differences Within MSZMP Viewed

PM1010142589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent A. Kuklin article: "Authorities and Arguments: Complex Search For Ways To Renew the Party in Store for Hungarian Communist Forum"]

[Text] Budapest—The congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] begins in Hungary today—a great many hopes are pinned on this event, the attention of the whole of Hungarian society is turned to it, and people abroad are fixing their gaze on it. This attention is understandable: The congress is of decisive significance for determining the country's appearance in the next few years. The congress is unprecedented also because not a single experienced observer is venturing to predict its outcome. This is how your TASS correspondent in Hungary begins his report written for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

In previous years, too, of course, party congresses were pivotal events in the country's political life. Their results, however, and future changes usually kept within a more or less conventional framework. But in recent months in Hungary all the established schemes have been destroyed, and destroyed by the course of life itself, furthermore. Events have happened so quickly and the situation has changed so fundamentally that sometimes it was even difficult to follow the course of the furious political passions in the country. As M. Nemeth, member of the MSZMP Presidium and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, said at the opening of the fall session of the Hungarian National Assembly, in the past few months decisions have been made in Hungary which previously would have required many long years.

The stakes at the present congress are higher than ever before. It must determine what the party will be like in the new conditions. And the communists' standing in the country and, consequently, the result of the forthcoming elections will depend on how correct the chosen course is.

Meanwhile, the changes taking place throughout rapidly changing Hungarian society are the same as those taking place in the party itself. The party is no longer what it once was, but it still hasn't determined its appearance in the new conditions. After last year's party conference, Hungarian communists discovered with some surprise that in the usually "united" MSZMP there existed a whole range of views on questions of the prospects for socialist building and that the party was divided into groups representing different approaches and directions. But the MSZMP Congress and the preparation for it inevitably caused all these views and directions to become polarized.

For the most part people here see nothing bad in the fact that the secret became open. Hungary's leaders have been saying that the fervent open debates, the exposure of contradictions and differences of objective interests, and finally the victory of arguments over authorities and the open struggle to win people over can only benefit the party, help to cleanse it, and lead to the elaboration of an effective program understood by all.

What is the disposition of forces within the MSZMP? Two extreme positions are represented by the so-called

fundamentalists, who accuse the MSZMP leadership of liquidationism, revisionism, and attempts to restore capitalism, and by the extreme radicals, who proclaim the need for a "revolution within the MSZMP." These are extremely small wings of the party which do not enjoy genuine influence and with which the majority of communists are hardly likely to agree.

The majority of MSZMP members have different opinions regarding the pace and depth of the reforms. Despite the confusion and contradictory nature of the political spectrum, four main directions which have been formed and organized recently can be discerned: They are the MSZMP reform societies, the "Rally for the Renewal of the MSZMP" movement, the United Marxist Platform, and the Ferenc Muennich society.

The MSZMP reform societies are a grassroots political movement which favors a program of radical transformations. Rank and file communists, dissatisfied with the pace of the reforms and the actions of the MSZMP's political leadership and believing that they must work actively for the sake of the party's future, held discussions in their own free time and elaborated their own proposals and program for renewal.

In their program the reform societies insist on radical reform of the MSZMP's entire structure, reliance on grassroots party organizations and rank and file communists, a radical reduction of the apparatus, and the elimination of its former plenary powers. They also demand a place in the political leadership for new young leaders and a change in the principles whereby the party's leading role is exercised. In their opinion, the party's leading role and the party's general influence on the life of the state and society should be exercised solely through the attainment of a majority in parliament and parliament's appointment of communists to government and other state posts. Consequently, the MSZMP reform societies believe, the need for the nomenklatura system and all direct party influence on production and economic life will disappear.

The "Rally for the Renewal of the MSZMP" movement, whose leading light is believed to be J. Berecz, former Politburo member and former secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee in charge of ideological questions, also proclaims reforms. In the view of that wing of the MSZMP, however, to implement those reforms it is necessary to achieve unity within the party and get rid of "one-sidedness, pseudoradicalism, and demagoguery." The movement expects the congress to produce the victory of the "renewed MSZMP."

Representatives of the United Marxist Platform believe that in Hungary now forces are organizing which overtly or covertly are using the slogan of a change of model to prepare for the restoration of capitalism in the country. In the United Marxist Platform's opinion, the current leadership of the MSZMP, utilizing the slogans of reform, has finally dissociated itself from party members and without consulting them has made unauthorized decisions on basic political questions. In Hungary, they state, it isn't Marxism which has failed but the leadership which has divorced itself from Marxism.

The Ferenc Muennich society, which takes its name from a comrade-in-arms of Janos Kadar, also criticizes the present MSZMP leadership and advocates the "preservation of socialism's achievements and a party based on Marxist-Leninist principles which bears a class nature and is characterized by socialist patriotism and internationalism and the Leninist principles of democratism and ultimately collectivism."

The United Marxist Platform and the Ferenc Muennich Society consist mainly of people of the older generation.

In the Ferenc Muennich Society's opinion, the MSZMP has already ceased to exist as a united Marxist-Leninist party. There are two main trends in it—a communist one, represented by the Ferenc Muennich Society, and a "Eurocommunist" one, that is the reform societies. The center is located between them.

By all accounts, everything at this congress will hinge on the position taken by the communists who still haven't clarified a definitive attitude toward the programs put forward by the various tendencies. In the opinion of many observers they are still the majority. The reform societies see their precongress task in winning over this "silent majority" to their side. If that doesn't work and none of the programs wins a convincing majority at the congress, it is possible that the party may split.

Even though on the whole the positions of R. Nyers, M. Pozsgay, and M. Nemeth, despite their existing differences, are closest to the views of the MSZMP reform societies, there are a number of serious differences between the program documents prepared by the current MSZMP leadership and the societies' program. For example, while the party leadership has put forward a course of privatization (the transfer of state enterprises to private ownership), the reform societies talking about a social market economy in which the most desirable form of ownership is social ownership of a new type—cooperative ownership and ownership by local councils and self-managing labor collectives. Furthermore, it cannot be ruled out either that the current party leadership's position will move closer to the reform societies' views, particularly if they gain a majority of congress delegates. There has already been a definite rapprochement of positions when the party's leaders accepted the proposal to participate in the work of the reform societies' conference.

As MTI reports, this year nearly 78,000 party members have left the MSZMP and just 2,600 people joined during that period.

It is hard to predict now how events will develop at the congress. We will receive the answers to many questions in the next few days.

CPSU Legal Policy Commission Visits Bulgaria

PM1110085789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general rubric "Official Reports"]

[Text] A delegation of the CPSU Central Committee Legal Policy Commission headed by A.A. Khomyakov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, visited Bulgaria 2 through 6 October at the invitation of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee. A thorough exchange of information and experience in the elaboration of approaches to the implementation of the legal reforms in the two countries took place in talks with G. Atanasov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers; D. Stoyanov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the BCP Central Committee; G. Yordanov and S. Ovcharov, candidate members of the BCP Central Committee Politburo; V. Palin, Y. Radev, and G. Tanev, members of the BCP Central Committee; leaders of the Varna Oblast and Pleven Municipal BCP Committees; and law enforcement ministries and departments.

Rogachev, Bulgarian Aide Discuss Asia-Pacific

PM0610151389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
6 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] Sofia, 5 Oct—Soviet-Bulgarian consultations have been held here on certain problems of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region.

I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, and M. Ivanov, Bulgarian first deputy foreign minister, took part in the consultations on the Soviet and Bulgarian side respectively.

West Europe

Gorbachev To Visit Finland 25-27 Oct

LD1210172189 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT
12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will pay an official visit to Finland from October 25 to 27, 1989 at the invitation of President Mauno Koivisto of Finland, it was announced here today.

Thatcher on Gorbachev's Leadership Qualities

PM1310084589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
7 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: " 'Good Chances of Success'"]

[Text] London, 6 Oct—During a conversation with a group of U.S. journalists in London, British Prime Minister Thatcher touched on Anglo-Soviet relations and the results of her recent working meeting with M.S. Gorbachev.

As always, she noted, we had a very useful conversation and discussed aspects of international policy in the utmost detail. This was an exceptionally valuable visit and I think that such meetings are mutually beneficial.

Turning subsequently to the situation in the Soviet Union, M. Thatcher noted that it is easier to grant political freedoms than to implement economic transformations. The whole system in the Soviet Union has now acquired an open character, politicians are showing a higher profile, and there is a completely new atmosphere in the country. However, the implementation of economic reform is a different kettle of fish. And in the process, the head of the British cabinet pointed out, there is a bureaucracy to deal with, no pricing or cost-fixing mechanism, and on top of that many people in the country are not clear on the question of how this reform should be implemented. The politicians cannot implement it unless people themselves begin working with greater determination and change their style of work. Such a reform can be implemented only in conditions of partnership between the government and the people, and prosperity cannot be achieved without effort.

I have never underestimated the scale of the problems facing M. Gorbachev, M. Thatcher stated. But he demonstrates brilliant qualities as a leader, which the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum on the party's nationalities policy in present-day conditions also showed. I think that he has a good chance of success, and I believe that he will realize his plans.

Yakovlev Receives UK Communist Party Leader

PM1110144889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Interparty Contacts"]

[Text] On 10 October G. McLennan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain [CPGB], arrived in Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. He was accompanied by I. McKay and N. Temple, members of the CPGB Executive Committee Political Committee.

On the same day A.N. Yakovlev had a meeting with G. McLennan. In the course of a comradely talk they exchanged information on their parties' activity, discussed the prospects for interparty cooperation, and examined topical questions of the development of the situation in Europe.

I. McKay, N. Temple, and V.M. Falin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, took part in the talk.

Brutents Heads CPSU Visit to Ireland

PM1110152189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visiting Ireland"]

[Text] Dublin, 9 Oct—A CPSU delegation, headed by K.N. Brutents, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, arrived here today at the invitation of the Workers Party of Ireland.

Ryzhkov Receives Netherlands Delegation

PM1310100189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Report on Council of Minister Chairman Ryzhkov's reception of a Dutch agricultural delegation: "Meeting With Netherlands Delegation"]

[Text] On 12 October, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov received Johannes Lammers, royal commissioner of Flevoland Province of the Netherlands, entrepreneur Ernst van Eigen, and Franc Holstein, representative of Agrico Agro-Industrial Cooperative, who arrived in Moscow to discuss Soviet-Netherlands economic ties.

The guests from the Netherlands said they visited the Soviet Union because there is much interest in their country for the development of mutually-advantageous cooperation with the USSR.

The sides discussed the creation of a model agro-industrial complex in one of the central districts in the USSR which could become a base for training leaseholders and developing advanced technology for agricultural production.

Ryzhkov emphasized that the Soviet side, on the basis of intergovernmental contacts and long-term programmes for the development of cooperation between the USSR and the Netherlands is striving to deepen Soviet-Netherlands business ties, particularly in the area of the agro-industrial complex.

The experience of cooperation in this area is positively appraised in the Soviet Union, and it is held that there is a good prospect for its widening.

Of much interest is the development of non-traditional forms of cooperation with the uses of new possibilities which open due to the economic reform and development of leaseholding.

V.V. Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases, and USSR People's Deputy F.M. Burlatskiy were present at the conversation.

USSR-Netherlands Cooperation Agreement Signed

PM1210075989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Oct 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Agreement Signed"]

[Text] An agreement on the encouragement and mutual protection of capital investments was signed between the USSR and the Netherlands in Moscow 5 October. It was signed for the Soviet side by N.P. Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and by USSR Finance Minister V.S. Pavlov, and for the Netherlands side by R.W. de Korte, Netherlands deputy prime minister and minister of economic affairs, and by P. Buwalda, Netherlands ambassador to the USSR.

K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, was present.

Talks were held on questions of the development of Soviet-Netherlands business cooperation.

Belgian King Greeted on National Day

PM1210155389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] On the occasion of Belgium's national day, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium sent a telegram to King Baudouin expressing confidence that the deepening and expansion of all-around cooperation between the Soviet Union and Belgium will continue to promote the strengthening of international security and will make a contribution toward the creation of a common European home.

In a message in reply, the Belgian head of state spoke in favor of the development of balanced and harmonious cooperation between the USSR and Belgium.

Latin America & America

Shevardnadze, Castro Note 'Successful' Relations

LD0610220489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1102 GMT 6 Oct 89

[Text] Havana, 6 Oct (TASS)—On Thursday [5 October] the brief working visit to Cuba by Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, ended.

At the "Jose Marti" international airport he was seen off by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the State Council and Council of Ministers of the Republic, and other Cuban leaders.

Among those seeing him off were Julio Camacho Aguilera, member of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and the Cuban ambassador to the USSR, and Yu.Y. Petrov, USSR ambassador to Cuba.

In a brief conversation with journalists at the airport Fidel Castro and E. Shevardnadze noted the successful development of comprehensive Soviet-Cuban relations.

The Soviet minister valued highly the results of the talks with the Cuban leader on a wide spectrum of issues. In keeping with the tradition which has been formed, I had interesting, profound conversations with Comrade Fidel Castro, which took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere and were characterized by mutual understanding. He stressed that the exchange of opinions which took place showed a complete coincidence of views and criteria on the main problems of the present time, both of a global and regional nature. We reached full mutual understanding. In the course of the negotiations, mutual support and solidarity with regard to the construction of socialism in Cuba and the processes now taking place in the Soviet Union were expressed.

Answering a question from TASS correspondents, Fidel Castro described present Soviet-Cuban relations as very good. In all honesty I may say that in the relations between our countries a favorable climate of mutual trust exists, stated the Cuban leader. [passage omitted]

For his part, E.A. Shevardnadze not only confirmed the Soviet Union's support for the Nicaraguan initiatives, but also called on the U.S. Government, jointly with the USSR, to be guarantor to a possible agreement on regional security. The establishment of peace in the region is necessary in order to turn Central America into a zone of peace. The possibility of the outbreak of regional conflicts and foreign interference in the internal affairs of these states must be excluded.

The governments of Nicaragua and the USSR have as their aim guaranteeing, for the immediate upcoming years, the irreversibility of the Guatemala accords and the creation of new forms of relations between governments.

The first step on the road to a new regional agreement is the restoration of mutual trust between the United States and Nicaragua. More than anything, this would facilitate President G. Bush's administration's taking responsibility for achieving the actual disbanding of the Contras and the immediate cessation of terrorist acts against the Nicaraguan people.

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Plan Commission Discussions Cited

PM1210093189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[IZVESTIYA special correspondent V. Romanyuk article under the rubric "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session": "What Should the Plan Be Like? Notes on the Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget and Finance Commission's Work"]

[Text] Not a single figure on trust!—the essence of the examination of the draft State Plan for the Country's Economic and Social Development for 1990, which took place in the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission, can thus be formulated. L.B. Vid, deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Commission [Gosplan], who delivered the report on this question, tried to present the draft law formulated by the government in a most attractive manner.

Let us talk first about the main positive structural changes in industry: 0.5 percent growth is planned for group "A," and 6.7 percent growth for group "B." These figures mark our economy's swing toward the person and his real needs. In many sectors the plan provides for a 10-fold increase in the pace of consumer goods production above the basic program. This, for example, is the situation in the defense complex: The manufacture of arms has been cut by 7 percent, and civilian output has increased by 21.4 percent. This is the real meaning of conversion.

The draft plan establishes a whole series of priorities in the social sphere, particularly to expand the production of goods for the market, to develop agricultural construction, and to improve medical services. It cannot be denied that an attractive picture is presented. Completely in the spirit of the decisions made by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

But the commission members were not swayed by the magic of figures, and they simply doubted many draft indicators. In particular, on the subject of what may be expected from saving resources, L.B. Vid was obliged to also talk about the forthcoming drop in the growth rate of electricity output, fertilizer production, and an absolute drop in oil and coal extraction. After all this, it was difficult to believe the plan figures for increasing the output of textiles and clothing, refrigerators, and washing machines and increasing trade turnover (by R40 billion).

The first question put to the keynote speaker by Deputy G.I. Filshin concerned precisely this aspect of affairs: Is it possible to believe in such a rapid growth rate next year if we have much more modest targets now, but we are not fulfilling them?

The lively discussion which developed around the draft proposals confirmed that the object of the Gosplan variant was more to oblige the Supreme Soviet than to outline a real plan of action and work out the mechanism to achieve the real aims. It turned out that the high plan figures do not have a guaranteed supply of resources, equipment, or cadres. Resources show a "decrease," while the draft plan envisages an "increase" in goods production. This is possible only by restructuring the entire technological basis, and it is exactly this which is not evident. At the same time wasteful tendencies have not been overcome. Deputy S.N. Khadzhiyev pointed this out: "The draft plan contains growth rate indicators based, as before, on existing achievements instead of building the plan from the people's needs."

Indeed, for many decades we were proud of our growth rate, and the shelves were full of goods not needed by anyone. The same old approaches are also contained in the new draft. In any case L.B. Vid was unable to give an intelligible answer to the question: Had the methodology to formulate the draft plan for 1990 been fundamentally changed?

The deputies also gave a critical analysis of those figures which reflected the development of the most important areas. It turned out that a number of "priorities" are lagging behind even the growth rate of the stagnant years.

The discussion showed that sometimes the deputies also display adherence to the stereotypes of the edict and directive economy. While welcoming the expansion of enterprises' independence in the planning work, some of them called on the USSR Gosplan not to lose control of the whole planning sector, which essentially marked a return to the times of rigid supervision of each plan indicator. Proposals were made to expand the itemized lists of articles included in the state order, right down to facing tiles and toilet bowls. People resorted to the same arbitrary procedures when it was a question of overcoming shortages—of soap and toothpaste, electric irons and razor blades, batteries, and cigarettes. And here the deputies were fully supported by central department representatives.

However, a more weighty approach prevailed: Of all the "shortages" the deputies singled out first and foremost the shortage of fresh ideas, fervor, and constructive approaches appropriate to the acuteness, even urgency of the situation taking shape in the market.

But for all that attempts to build superb plans on sand were resolutely rejected. One of the deputies asked the rhetorical question: Who, basically, is responsible for the current plans' failures? No one! Will the result be that the same thing will happen to the 1990 plan? The same but not quite! If the deputies' commission approves the proposed draft, then it will bear full responsibility for it. And the fact that the Supreme Soviet will share it with the government does not change things. All this forced them to analyze each line of the draft plan even more rigorously and painstakingly.

A polemic around the additional billion allocated to scientific development flared up unexpectedly fiercely. The scientific sphere has always been considered the locomotive of technical progress. This time numerous complaints were expressed about it. On account of the lag in scientific development the national income's energy and metal intensiveness is being reduced only slowly. This fact was also cited: In places where 8 grams of imported herbicide is needed, 8 kg of the domestic compound is used. Deputy P.M. Chursina, a weaver by profession, stated that the new machine tools differ from the old only in price, and the principles of their work are still the old ones.

The deputies proposed a whole package of measures making it possible to really improve the market situation. For example, a sharp increase, by R2-3 billion, in the sale to the population of timber, cement, linoleum, and glass. And, conversely, the withdrawal from trade of particleboard and its switch to the furniture industry, where it can be utilized more efficiently, thus profiting the public coffers. The agro-industrial complex is sustaining great losses on account of the absence of modern storage facilities. Refrigerators and freezer equipment must be produced in far greater quantities than at present. Finally, there are more untapped reserves to be found in strengthening discipline and order. There must be material compensation for any harm done to the national economy.

During the discussion of the draft other assessments were also expressed. Thus, Deputy A.K. Orlov noted the positive elements in the draft connected with the reorientation of aims and the economy's financial improvement. Other deputies also noted this positive side of the draft. But most agreed that the draft plan basically fails to introduce anything new, but instead contains completely unfounded attempts to provide for "superacceleration" in a sphere which has hitherto been beset with problems. The USSR Gosplan evidently has not found the mechanism to effectively combine the plan principle with the market system. The draft plan, in the deputies' opinion, contains only the supposition that the enterprises will cope with the targets. But in the present situation there is nothing to indicate that a "boom" is approaching; on the contrary, the forces of inertia are dragging the economy backward. The dissipation of resources among many construction projects continues, and loss-making enterprises are being financed as before; the country continues to remain the raw material appendage of states with a more dynamic economy.

N.Ya. Petrakov, the leader of the working deputies' group, cited a whole series of arguments which on the whole increased the commission's distrust for the proposed draft plan for 1990. The positive structural changes outlined on paper are not supported by a major reorientation in the supply of resources—we have already talked about this. Centralized capital investments have been cut—they have been shifted "downwards," to enterprises, but without resources backing. For whom is this blessing? In addition, a severalfold increase in credit is envisaged, but it is not clear from what sources. Emergency measures are needed. We are becoming like a bus with passengers rushing toward a precipice, and the driver wants to save the passengers by executing a smooth braking action. The degree and limits of the planning organs' responsibility for the draft plan presented should at last be defined. What do we have? A plan-cum-directive or a plan-cum-assessment? The expression "The Plan is the Law!" turned into a declaration pure and simple long ago. The directive part of the plan must be distinguished from the assessment indicators.

Summing up the results of the discussion, which lasted many hours, V.G. Kucherenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission, noted that proportions of the draft plan correspond to the Congress of People's Deputies' recommendations. But its individual links need to be analyzed seriously. The main point is that we must throw out everything which has been varnished and which is unrealistic, this entire game of playing with figures.

A more modest but realistic program, the results of which will be felt by broad sections of the population, must be presented for the Supreme Soviet's examination.

Privileges Commission Discussions Reported

PM1310081589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[A. Davydov report: "Privileges and Fairness; USSR Supreme Soviet Commission Session"]

[Text] The routine third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission to examine the privileges enjoyed by individual categories of citizens took place under the chairmanship of Deputy Ye.M. Primakov.

The deputies familiarized themselves with letters and proposals from working people addressed to the commission and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and these were discussed. As reported at the session, many people writing in are resolutely in favor of abolishing without exception all privileges provided for nomenklatura workers—state summer houses, "hunting lodges," special distribution centers for goods in great demand, the goods ordering system, special shops for producing foodstuffs, so called "lists" to obtain out of turn tickets in short supply for cultural and entertainment events, and so on. There were many requests proposing redistributing the housing stock, introducing a single living area norm, and setting a higher charge for having more of it than necessary. A number of people wrote in advocate the abolition of personal pensions.

The deputies supported a proposal to study thoroughly questions connected with granting such advantages and privileges and to work out specific recommendations. This will be dealt with by working groups covering the following areas: health care, the leisure industry, trade,

transportation, housing, culture, pension provision, and everyday services. Here, in order to size up the phenomenon, it is clear that the total extent of these advantages and privileges in terms of cost, the proportion of them in the state budget, and the specific material sources from which they are funded will have to be determined. The work will be quite complex. And it is not only a question of the need to calculate and take account of everything. It is very important, the commission chairman stressed, that our activity completely accords with the principles of fairness, expediency, and morality.

The session's participants focused particularly on the field of medicine. Most deputies believe it expedient to maintain the existing territorial-departmental principle of organizing public health. This approach accords with world practice. It is impermissible to carry on financing departmental medical establishments at the expense of public health care—this is another matter, deputies believe. The commission recommended the transfer to appropriate departments of all health centers, hospitals, and sanatoriums of various USSR Ministry of Health main administrations which are financed from the public health budget. The first step has already been taken. A number of children's sanatoriums of the USSR Ministry of Health Fourth Main Administration have recently been switched to general use, and also to the Soviet Children's Foundation. Some of them are being converted into interrayon children's diagnostic centers. The deputies proposed allocating from the state budget for 1990 an additional R3 billion for developing territorial health care, and very soon local soviets will also begin receiving the appropriate allocations from enterprises.

USSR Compliance With CSCE Norms Viewed

PM1210151589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Morning Edition p3

[Interview with F.M. Burlatskiy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and head of the Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee's subcommittee on humanitarian, scientific, and cultural cooperation, by own correspondent A. Ostalskiy: "Laws Lagging Behind; Opinion of One of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committees on the Progress of Our Country in Fulfilling the Vienna Accords"—date and place unspecified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] In January this year, as 1 of the 35 CSCE participant-states, the Soviet Union signed the Vienna Meeting's Final Document and thereby pledged to bring its legislation and practice into line with the provisions of this document. The USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee took a decision on 6 October assessing our country's progress in fulfilling the Vienna accords in the humanitarian and legal sphere. This assessment is based on a draft prepared by the subcommittee on humanitarian, scientific, and cultural cooperation, headed by F.M. Burlatskiy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Our IZVESTIYA correspondent asked him to comment on the decision and primarily answer the question: Can we consider to be satisfactory the Soviet Union's fulfillment of the pledges it has made?

[Burlatskiy] Not entirely, in my opinion. Of course, a great deal has been done in this direction since the beginning of the year; this was said by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.L. Adamishin at a sitting of the committee. For example, the procedure for leaving and entering the Soviet Union has been considerably liberalized. The emigration problem has largely been resolved. There are now more difficulties and restrictions on the part of the states where potential emigres would like to go, such as the United States, for example. There has also been a radical change in attitude to the church. And as far as freedom of the press and freedom of speech are concerned, the achievements of glasnost are evident to all. Some 50,000-60,000 different informal organizations have been set up in the country, many of which are putting forward social and political ideas. Foreign radio stations are no longer jammed. As a whole, Soviet people now have freer access to information.

[Ostalskiy] But surely all this could be reversed and the old system restored in the twinkling of an eye if we do not adopt the necessary legislation to give legal backing to the corresponding rights and freedoms? Where are these laws, which the Supreme Soviet should have adopted during this session?

[Burlatskiy] Yes, the task of providing legal backing and bringing our national legislation into line with the Vienna accords is now the main one. We have made serious complaints against the government organs, ministries, and departments which were made responsible for drawing up draft laws in the human rights sphere and achieving a real breakthrough in this area. We had hoped to receive draft laws from them ready for this session: on entering and leaving the Soviet Union, on social associations in the USSR, and on freedom of conscience and religious organizations. But so far we have received only one of the promised documents: a draft law on the press and the mass media. What is more, we sometimes cannot even establish where, in which departments, documents have got "held up." For example, despite all our efforts, we have as yet been unable to discover in which channels the draft law on social organizations is hidden. So there are obvious delays in passing laws needed first and foremost by our own citizens. This also does nothing for our image in the eyes of the international public.

[Ostalskiy] What is causing this strange situation?

[Burlatskiy] First of all, the principle whereby draft laws are drawn up by individual departments, secretly, behind closed doors is wrong. They are afraid to let documents out of their sight until they are deemed ready—but they themselves lose out because of this! We need a new procedure for drafting legislation: The Supreme Soviet committees and commissions must take full responsibility for this from the start. When necessary, they could involve the relevant departments,

defining quite specific responsibilities for each of them. Various scientific centers and social organizations could at the same time be instructed to prepare alternative drafts and then, in the course of a detailed discussion, the optimum version would be reached. But, unfortunately, this ideal has yet to be achieved and we cannot, of course, absolve of all responsibility those departments instructed to draw up draft laws in the shortest time possible.

[Ostalskiy] But surely it is not just a question of speed but also of quality...?

[Burlatskiy] You are right. We are constantly coming up against half-hearted decisions and incomprehensible indecisiveness. Take the question of freedom to enter and leave the Soviet Union, for example. After all, the possibility for anyone to travel to any country at any time for as long as they wish is an elementary right enshrined in many international documents. But how many heated arguments there have been in our departments in the process of discussing this question! Until recently, some insisted that Soviet citizens could travel abroad only at the invitation of relatives or friends.

[Ostalskiy] But what is behind this view?

[Burlatskiy] It is absurd, but it seems that this is demanded by... the class approach! But I really cannot understand why a worker in a capitalist country can take a holiday wherever he wishes—Spain, Italy, Yugoslavia, Hungary, the Soviet Union, for example—while our own Soviet worker has to be deprived of this right. If we are going to work on the basis of class, surely under socialism the working people should have broader rights than under capitalism? But it is only now, under strong pressure, that the norm of freedom of movement for Soviet citizens is being incorporated in the draft law.

[Ostalskiy] Norms are all very well, but obviously the appropriate practical backing and material possibilities are also needed for them to be translated into practice....

[Burlatskiy] Yes, that is very important. There are enormous queues at currency exchange points, and tickets to many countries, such as the United States, for example, have to be ordered virtually a year in advance. That is why we have drawn the attention of Comrade A.N. Volkov, USSR minister of civil aviation, to the need to take urgent measures to ensure citizens' free movement. We have also put forward the suggestion that every Soviet citizen have a 10-year foreign travel passport and a set foreign currency fund—approximately 200 foreign currency rubles per year, for example. In other words, we must take steps to ensure that newly acquired rights do not just remain on paper. Our committee has submitted the proposal to the USSR Council of Ministers to speed up the progress of draft laws and work out a mechanism for their practical implementation.

[Ostalskiy] Do you believe in the force of the decision adopted by your committee and in the fact that it will have effect in practice?

[Burlatskiy] That question is relevant—this is shown by past experience. But we can see that the government and the various departments have begun to listen to us with new, closer attention. But we still have to keep a sharp look-out and constantly monitor progress in the implementation of our decisions.

[Ostalskiy] Fedor Mikhaylovich, you said that just one draft law is in fact ready for discussion: the draft law on the press and mass media. How perfect is this draft, in your opinion, and what kind of changes has your committee recommended be made to it?

[Burlatskiy] It seems to me that we have the basis of a draft law, but it is still far from ideal. I would even go so far as to say that there is a certain touch of provincialism about it, an insularity and remoteness from the modern world that has yet to be overcome. The proposed draft does not even have a section on international cooperation. We have put forward our own draft in order to make the most of all the possibilities offered by modern communication methods, including cable and satellite communication. It is time we became a civilized country whose people can watch foreign television and read the foreign press. This, incidentally, is also envisaged by the Vienna accords. We also believe that the law should incorporate the concept of freedom of speech as people's right to freely express their opinion, including the right to seek and obtain, reproduce, and disseminate any information or idea: verbally, in written form, in artistic form, and so forth. It goes without saying that all this must take account of the restrictions laid down by law. In addition to this, we also propose that the law regulate the activity of representatives of the foreign mass media. During the discussions in the committee, ideas were also expressed on other fundamental issues: on the rights of social organizations, individual groups, and citizens to institute organs of the press, on banning the propaganda of pornography and fascism, and on the mechanism of refutation in the press. A general proposal was also made—to substantially reduce the draft law and remove norms which could be incorporated in the moral code of journalism. This code could be drawn up and adopted by the USSR Union of Journalists.

Committee Discussion on Land Use Described

PM1210152789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Valentin Lyashenko report under the rubric "At the USSR Supreme Soviet": "Debate on Land. Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food Concludes Work on New Guidelines for Land Use"]

[Text] Feelings started running high in the buses taking the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies who are members of the Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food from Kalinin Prospekt, where the committee is in permanent session, to the venue for the new sitting—the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences. These feelings were not calmed either by the steadily falling sleet or

by the entirely understandable fatigue induced by the many hours of daily work that had gone before. The deputies made no secret of the fact that this was a special day and a special sitting. After all, they would have to work out and submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet virtually the most fateful law for our settlements, villages, all the country's peasantry, and our entire life from here on....

Yes, of course, they were discussing an issue which, as Vladimir Ilich Lenin put it, is the key question in any revolution—land and the new land legislation. This issue has always been a burning and anxious question at all times. It is primordial, like land itself—at any rate, since the emergence of arable farming. People got agitated about it in the Roman forum, at the Novgorod assemblies, in the Russian Social-Democratic Workers Party, at the Russian State Duma.... We recall how brilliantly it was resolved by the portentous Decree on Land adopted by the Second Congress of the Soviets in October 1917.

And now here we are at the committee sitting... In the year 1989... When it is clear to each of us that the system of land relations operating in our country has become hopelessly obsolete, since it has totally divorced the land from peasants as masters, turned them into hired hands, and, as a result, has had a highly pernicious effect on the country's food supplies....

The committee was, for once, unanimous in noting this sad fact. And, in fact, what is there to discuss—you need only visit any nearby food store. It is also clear to all and sundry that we need a radical and fundamental break with our current land arrangements... But, on the other hand, it is easier to destroy something than to create something to take its place... It is so easy to throw the baby out with the bathwater....

However, this was one occasion when the committee members—practical people, economists, and lawyers—did have a choice. Several already thoroughly elaborated draft programs for land restructuring and several versions of the new land legislation guidelines have already been submitted for expert assessment. They include, for instance, a wide-ranging detailed program from the USSR Council of Ministers, a version of the guidelines worked out by the All-Union Agricultural Academy (the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences program), and what is to a certain extent an alternative to these two options—a draft from the Committee for Economic Reform Questions, or, as it is known to everyone, the draft by Academician V.A. Tikhonov of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences....

But a fourth draft was also submitted. All the deputies were given a copy of the 27 September 1989 issue of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, which published extensive proposals on the renewal of acts of legislation relating to the land and land use submitted by the hereditary peasant Vladimir Konstantinovich Reutov, a teacher from Nikolskoye Village in Astrakhan Oblast's Yenotayevskiy Rayon. He has been personally invited to the auditorium to attend the committee sitting. And he was given the floor among the first speakers in order to defend his draft.

I could see that Vladimir Konstantinovich was nervous, but he spoke confidently, firmly, and of course, without notes (reading out speeches is not the practice here):

"I know full well how presumptuous it is of me, a country teacher, to speak from this rostrum about matters on such a scale. But these ideas have not just come to me overnight, you could say that they are the result of my life's work...."

Previously, in his long speech, Academician A.A. Nikonov, president of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, had said the following about his draft:

"We are particularly grateful to the country teacher Reutov, who came up with an important legislative initiative in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.... As you can see, the mechanism proposed by him for implementing land ownership largely coincides with the USSR Council of Ministers program and almost wholly coincides with the program proposed by the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences. Yet his is the voice of the backwoods, the voice of the peasantry, Comrades...."

Yes, the key question in all four programs is that of land ownership, the types and forms of ownership, and the means of implementing it. The USSR Council of Ministers program, the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences program, and the program from the country teacher Reutov, which has now become an integral part of it, state that under the conditions of the socialist economic management system there are no grounds for abandoning one of the main gains of October—ownership of the land by all the people. In other words, the essence of the agrarian reform should not be to dismantle the principle of the nationalization of the land or to abandon state ownership of the land, but to find entirely new forms of implementing that ownership, to reinforce the principle of the full authority of the soviets in the sphere of land arrangements, and to transfer land to the soviets.

Given such a form of ownership, the state (the state and the republic in the Council of Ministers draft) remains (and the republic becomes) the supreme legal owner of the land. It merely transfers its ownership (in the Council of Ministers program its use) to the soviets in perpetuity. In other words, the land belongs to the population, including collective and state farms [kolkhozes and sovkhozes] located on the territory of a given soviet, while the soviet acts on the population's behalf as the legal owner (user) of the land in question.

That is how the question is framed in principle. It seems to have appealed to most of the committee members. Nonetheless, the deputies listened attentively and with

interest to the counterarguments advanced by Academician V.A. Tikhonov of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, defending the program of the Committee for Economic Reform.

State ownership of the land as realized through the soviets? Land use hiding behind the word "ownership"? Isn't this the same old story, just rehashed somewhat? The peasants are the principals of land ownership. They have to control the land with ownership rights and be the actual rather than nominal proprietors of it. State ownership of the land should not be abolished. Whatever this ownership is called—state ownership, state-republic ownership, nationwide ownership, or ownership by all the people—it is all a fiction. "Our slogan," Academician Tikhonov said, "is the denationalization of the land."

Animation in the hall, some deputies jumped out of their seats impatiently. Questions were put point blank, in a peasant fashion, without a veil of diplomacy:

"So, the Decree on the Nationalization of Land was a mistake on the part of the revolution?"

"How are we to distribute land? Are we to sell it, or what? So I'm to buy up land, and hire farm laborers...."

Academician Tikhonov explained that, according to this draft, each republic and its people, including autonomous republics, are to independently choose their forms of land ownership. The same goes for the forms of transferring land. Yes, direct sale of land is also possible. Certainly, in that case there is a danger of rentiers appearing. But, according to Tikhonov, that is still better than if the land is merely leased. Peasant psychology and the peasant heart do not accept by its very nature ownership confined within any framework.

"You are urging people to leave the kolkhoz and become single peasant farmers?"

"No, I am by no means in favor of disbanding kolkhozes.... I am in favor of ensuring that every peasant has at any moment the right to voluntarily leave the kolkhoz with a plot of land and his accumulated property. I am in favor of complete freedom of economic activity and the right of free choice. If you do not want to leave the kolkhoz, do as you please."

At this point the chairman asked people to stop yelling fom the floor and ask questions in an organized fashion.

N.V. Lemesheva, deputy and kolkhoz chairman (Vitebsk Oblast): Vladimir Aleksandrovich, all the same, if we are being frank? In your opinion, to whom does the future belong? The kolkhozes or peasant, farm livestock units?

V.A. Tikhonov: The future belongs to individual peasant farms united into cooperatives of various forms and directions.... But I want to stress, Comrades, that all the drafts submitted for your consideration today contain far more points of coincidence and overall points of contact than differences. Is it not better for us to concentrate our attention on things where we have achieved our objective simultaneously, without prior arrangement, so to speak?

It seems that by no means all committee members agree with this formulation of the question. There are differences and we have decided to dwell on them in more detail. For instance, there are a considerable number of variations even between the USSR Council of Ministers and the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences-Reutov programs, which are quite close in spirit. The Council of Ministers' draft, for instance, introduces the concept of union-republic land ownership, while the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences describes it as all-union property (but in both cases it is proposed to implement land ownership, as has already been said, via the soviets). The draft defended by Academician Tikhonov, as we already know, proposes rendering land ownership to the individual.

If, as one must think, these are by no means differences of nuance and no mere games with terminology. Many deputies, for instance, criticized the term "use of land" in the Council of Ministers' program, favoring the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences' term "land ownership." Yes, "ownership," although by and large in both drafts land remains the property of the state (or the state an the republic). There was more or less complete unanimity on this question—"ownership" of land presupposes a closer link between the specific person, the owner, and general state ownership, and—and this is the most important thing—corresponds to a greater degree, as one deputy said, with "his real position within the system of ownership favored by both these programs."

Or here is a question. Certainly, local soviets must, without doubt, manage land. But who has the right to deprive, say, a peasant farm, a leaseholder or a farmer, of land if the livestock is being managed in a poor manner and the land "is suffering"? The same soviet?

"No," a confident voice rang out from the floor, "that is not the prerogative of power, even Soviet power. A ban on ownership is outside its jurisdiction. Only a court can do this, by elucidating the sides' claims against one another."

There were objections to which he said: Are you proposing to take Soviet power to court? Answer: "Yes, a man must be protected from arbitrary rule under any power."

That is just how this very intense discussion went. Just as the waves of the sea smooth over every pebble, so the legislators' inquisitive thought thoroughly smoothed out every provision of the drafts.

N.N. Vorobyev, deputy and first secretary of Pytalovskiy Rayon Party Committee, Pskov Oblast (SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA has spoken on several occasions about the

people of Pytalovo, who chose the farm path of development owing to the specific conditions in the rayon):

"I categorically disagree with the provision in the Council of Ministers' draft whereby not only a local soviet but also a kolkhoz or a sovkhoz can be a leaseholder. Let us reach an unequivocal agreement: Both the sovkhoz and the kolkhoz are themselves leaseholders in relation to the soviet and are engaged in economic activity on land belonging to the soviet."

"But what is to be done then about intrakolkhoz leasing?"

"That is not a lease, that is a sublease, one of the elements in intrafarm transactions...."

It seems that most committee members are inclined to support Deputy N. Vorobyev. Here is another principle which deputies upheld unanimously: The right of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, peasant farms, and other land users to independently choose their system of crop farming and their production structure in the interests of boosting effectiveness must be enshrined for the first time in law. State and economic bodies are forbidden to interfere in the use of land that has been granted for ownership or use. Thus, both the soviets' power to dispose of land and also the user's right to engage in independent activity on the land are guaranteed.

Of course, payment for land must be introduced and a differential rent established. Deputies noted simultaneously that present-day rent payments exacted via an extremely contradictory and confused mechanism of purchase price differentiation must be replaced by direct, well-organized, and clear payments. It is a most complex question but it cannot be put off any longer. Several options for estimating the value of land were proposed, including the formula proposed by Academician Tikhonov, which seemed to be to many people's liking.

But these are, so to speak, narrow specialized issues. By and large, summing up the results of the sitting, Academician A. Nikonov noted a very interesting and characteristic pattern: While embarking independently on the quest at a fresh turn of economic and agricultural development, legislators have mainly elaborated principles that are similar in many respects to those contained in the well-known Land Decree of 1917 and the Central Executive Committee Decree of 1918. Here are these main fundamental principles:

Land is public property.
Use of hired labor during work on the land is precluded.
The peasants themselves choose the forms of work on the land.
Only the soviets have the right to dispose of land.

...The committee sitting has ended. Here is a brief summary from Nikolay Vorobyev:

"Am I satisfied with our work? Yes, I am. I think that this will be a strong, balanced, and responsible draft law, fully coordinated with the fundamental Law on Ownership and the Law on the Lease. We legislators must not make mistakes—for it is a question of the future of our countryside, the future of perestroyka and of our entire future life."

Price Expert Comments on Abalkin Speech

PM1210100989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1

[Interview with Professor A.G. Zhuravlev by S. Karkhanin commenting on the speech by L.I. Abalkin delivered at the 10 October second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, under the general heading "Kremlin Debates": "Asking the Voters"—date and place unspecified, first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Professor A.G. Zhuravlev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Questions' Subcommission on Prices, comments:

[Zhuravlev] I listened to this speech of L.I. Abalkin's at the Tuesday session with particular interest. It was no accident that it generated a stormy exchange of opinions among the deputies. The question of how to stabilize the consumer market is one of the most vexed and topical questions today. Naturally, there can be different approaches to its solution.

But the Supreme Soviet should not produce any superficial or hasty decisions. We are learning to foresee the entire spectrum of consequences and the entire range of reactions with which the economy responds to our measures. Of course, we would like to do some things immediately, particularly if the socioeconomic situation is heated. Yet we cannot fail to heed L.I. Abalkin's call for balance, calm, and, I would say, state wisdom.

Money, prices, and incomes are interlinked: It is clear that the problem under discussion at the session—the problem of stabilizing the consumer market—goes further than a simple price "freeze" and should be resolved comprehensively. Price restraint by itself will not be a panacea for all our ills. Although we are now forced to take this measure. We will have to establish a definite socially guaranteed minimum so that all citizens, wherever they live—be it in Uzbekistan or Siberia—should be firmly aware that the country guarantees them a certain "basket of consumer goods," covering, moreover, a range of goods and products. This means that the work we have begun should be continued in the local soviets.

We are now creating the prerequisites for successful activity by those who will soon join the ranks of our common corps of deputies locally and, consequently, we are obliged to be prudent and seek out opportunities for deepening the economic reform.

For instance, 3 years ago I mistakenly advocated raising prices in order to create a market. But nowadays we should not "interfere" with the economy under any circumstances. Of course, theoretically we could suppose

that free price growth would sooner or later lead to some kind of balance in the economy. But at what cost? Before rehabilitating itself it would self-destruct....

Our opponents call upon us to "provide scope." But scope for what? Disasters? The socioeconomic environment in which our society finds itself does not allow us to use classical methods.

Other opponents demand that we sharply increase imports of consumer goods. But who will purchase, or rather buy up, these goods in the first place? Once again it would be "black marketeers." Incidentally, the sharp administrative "clampdown" in this area suits precisely those people who have access to colossal funds and are able to earn iniquitous profits by clearing the shelves at state stores. We should give very serious consideration to this when working with the government on the joint draft document discussed at the Tuesday session.

We should lean neither to the right nor to the left and we should convince those who advocate abrupt steps that any "shake-up" of the economy in the current situation would lead to a complete collapse of the consumer market. We must not experiment with the living organism of the country or give way to the emotion clearly discernible in some of my fellow deputies' speeches. Anger, even if it is righteous, makes a poor counsel.

If only it were merely a question of a price "freeze" and of trading and purchasing cooperatives! Everything is far more complex and serious. The "black market" will find ways of getting around any ban if it is not based upon well-conceived economic measures. The government version of the draft resolution envisages, apart from anything else, a price "freeze"; this is more wide-ranging than what was discussed last week. This new option will provide grounds for launching an assault on the negative factors operating in our national economy, and with the help of mainly economic levers rather than out-and-out bans or restrictions.

After further work the document should provide a clear picture of where we are on the defensive and where we intend to go on to the offensive. In this sense the government position advanced by L.I. Abalkin is, in my view, preferable. The government is really concerned about the situation, has a deep understanding of it, and can see a way out of it. Joint work on the draft, I think, is likely to reinforce the businesslike cooperation between the Supreme Soviet and the government and to ensure that these contacts become more fruitful.

Of course, we people's deputies must consult with the voters and explain to them our policy as regards economic improvement. I think that we would find a kind of "electoral referendum" helpful: What do people think about the measures we are currently discussing? The people are wiser than any Supreme Soviet and any government—that is an abiding truth for us deputies.

Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet 11 Oct

Economic Reform Committee on 1990 Plan

LD1110224589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1358 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 11 Oct—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports:

The measures outlined by the government for 1990 for deepening the radical transformations in the Soviet economy do not answer the criticial character of the present situation. This was the conclusion reached by the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform.

At today's sitting, this permanent body of the Soviet parliament summed up the results of the hearings on the main thrusts of the development of the economic reform presented by the government in the draft of the state plan for next year. The committee will convey its conclusion to the Commission for Planning, Budget, and Finance of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The document speaks of the necessity of achieving the formation in the country of collective ownership and of the mass development of lease-holding in the national economy with the assistance of economic methods by 1990. The parliamentary committee considers it necessary to accelerate the preparation of the USSR laws on joint- stock societies, banks, and antitrust measures. Moreover, the deputies expressed themselves in favor of the elaboration of laws on prices, competition, and insurance.

In preparing the state plans and the country's budget for next year the government did not fully succeed in overcoming the residual principle of financing the sphere of education, science, and culture, it was noted at the meeting of another parliamentary committee, the Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing. In the course of the discussion, the deputies put forward a number of specific proposals to improve the documents. In particular, Nikolay Karlov, the committee's deputy chairman and rector of the Moscow Physicotechnical Institute, spoke out in favor of differentiating the appropriations for fundamental and applied science in the budget. In a conversation with the TASS correspondent Nikolay Karlov said that pooling them in one budget item will result in scientific institutions investing funds chiefly in resolving applied tasks, which yield a quick return. This will be followed by an outflow of the best scientists from fundadmental science into applied sectors.

The committee's members did not simply demand an increase in the appropriations for science, education, and culture, but also proposed specific sources for financing them. Thus, Deputy Vladimir Belyayev, Moscow, proposed that the financial funds earned by the

undertakings of higher institutions of learning should not be assigned to the budget but left within the education sphere.

This week, all parliamentary bodies must prepare their conclusions on the plan and budget, and by the end of next week the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission will prepare a generalized document, which will be submitted for discussion by parliament.

Medvedev, Others Take Part in 'Party Building'

LD1210181989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] On 11 October, a joint meeting took place of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on party building and cadre policy, of the CPSU Central Committee Legal Policy Commission, and of the CPSU Central Committee, opened the meeting with an introductory word.

Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made a statement on the matter being discussed.

During the exchange of opinions, 16 people spoke. Medvedev summed up the discussion that had taken place.

Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, also spoke at the meeting. Lukyanov, candidate member of the Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Pugo, chairman of the Party Central Committee attached to the CPSU Central Committee; Girenko, Tanayenkov, and Usmanov, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the work of the commissions.

[Moscow TASS in English at 1757 GMT on 12 October carries a report on the commission's meeting on 11 October, and adds the following:

"During the discussion it was noted that this spring's elections of USSR People's Deputies have reflected fundamentsl changes which took place in the social, economic, political and spiritual life of society, the complexity of the modern stage of perestroyka.

While resolutely supporting perestroyka, voters favored speeding it up to achieve practical results more rapidly. Erratic supplies of necessary goods, poor organisation of the work of trade and services, urban transport, the insanitary state of cities and villages, inadequate struggles against mismanagement, breaches of law, economic problems and neglected cultural landmarks have all acquired political urgency, the meeting heard."]

Election Process Viewed

LD1210203489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1725 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 12 Oct (TASS)—A joint meeting of the commissions of the CPSU Central Committee for party building and cadre policy, for legal policy, and of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Commission took place in Moscow on Wednesday [11 October]. Questions of preparing for the elections to republican and local organs of government were discussed.

Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, opened the meeting with an introductory address. Georgiy Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made a statement on the matter being discussed.

During the exchange of views it was noted that the election of USSR people's deputies, which took place in the spring of this year, reflected the fundamental changes that have taken place in society's socioeconomic, political, and intellectual life, and at the same time the complexity and contradictions of the present-day stage of perestroyka. The voters, having resolutely supported perestroyka, spoke out in favor of its pace being intensified and of practical results being achieved more quickly. In connection with this, the work of the party, local soviet and economic bodies, and leading cadres was assessed exigently. Such questions as interruptions in the daily supply to the population of necessities, the organization of the trade and services sphere, urban transport, the hygienic state of towns and villages, the insufficient struggle against wastefulness, violations of law and order, the unresolved state of economic problems, and the sometimes scornful attitude toward cultural monuments have become politically acute.

Many party committees turned out to be unprepared to work in the new democratic situation, displayed attachment to the old approaches, showed a casual approach, and relied on automatically receiving the electorate's trust.

It is important that the proper lessons are drawn from the past election campaign, particularly as the forthcoming elections mark a major boundary in implementing the political reform so that as a result of the elections, effective soviets are formed, which will be able to truly exercise their powers and will conduct matters in a new way and with initiative.

The election campaign will take place during preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress. This heightens the responsibility of party organizations, which must act vigorously, relying on political methods, and must skillfully conduct work with the electorate in the most various conditions. The decisions of the September (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which adopted a fundamental position on the nationalities

policy and on other major questions of the CPSU's work, are of great importance for the organization of election campaign work.

It was stressed that all preparatory work for the elections must be conducted openly, in a spirit of glasnost, consulting with the working people, actively drawing them into the electoral process, and that constructive cooperation must be established with all forces and act for the benefit of perestroyka. One should actively oppose attempts—whoever they may emanate from—to "pick up votes" using demagogic statements and empty promises.

The general approaches adopted by party organizations in their work should be determined by the Leninist principles of close contact between the party and the masses, and a true assessment of vital realities. But the main factor that ensures the success of this work is a real improvement in the socioeconomic situation, attention to people's needs, and the satisfaction of their vital requirements. In this connection, much attention was devoted to problems demanding an immediate solution, both in the center and locally.

During the exchange of views, 16 people spoke. A summing-up of the discussion was made by V.A. Medvedev. Taking part in the work of the commissions were: V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, who spoke at the session; A.I. Lukyanov, Candidate Member of the Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and B.K. Pugo, chairman of the party Control Committee attached to the CPSU Central Committee; and Secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee A.N. Girenko, YU.A. Manayenkov, and G.I. Usmanov.

Committees, Commissions Meet 12 Oct

Defense 'Conversion' Viewed

LD1210133789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1130 GMT on 12 October broadcasts a 5-minute report by Aleksandr Ruvinskiy, from the Moskva Hotel, on the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions.

He says that the committees and commissions are sitting in the Kremlin and in the Moskva Hotel, where some of them have their headquarters. Work has been done on the bill on languages.

In the Moskva Hotel, the Committee for Defense and State Security is meeting. Committee Chairman Vladimir Lapygin is interviewed, saying that the committee is discussing decisions on the plan and budget of defense industries and the budget of the Defense Ministry. Questions of conversion have been discussed.

On 11 October, at a session of the committee the conclusions on the budget of the Defense Ministry were formulated, Lapygin says, for the budget of the defense industries and the plan of the defense industries for 1990.

"It should be noted that as a result of these debates," Lapygin continues, "the budget of the Defense Ministry has been cut by R6.4 billion. At the same time, specially noting the lack of provision of our Armed Forces in respect of social and every-day needs, we have specially allocated a large sum to raise the pay of officers, sergeants, warrant officers, ensigns. We are now taking measures—to some extent, not fully—to make up for.. to create more favorable conditions for the work of our military people."

Draft Language, Property Laws Discussed

LD1210214489 Moscow TASS in English 2054 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—Permanent committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet continued their work today. People's deputies were thoroughly discussing draft legislative acts submitted to the second session of the country's parliament.

A meeting of the commission on the development of industry, power, and technology discussed a package of draft laws on property and the socialist enterprise. The debate brought to light considerable differences in the views of the deputies on property and new forms of relations in production.

It was decided to hold late in October a scientific-parliamentary conference on these problems. Deputies and leading Soviet economists will take part.

The draft law on property was discussed also by the committee on legislation, legality and law. The committee's working group prepared a document taking into consideration the provisions of the government draft law and ideas of an alternative draft law that was advanced by the committee on economic reforms and includes considerations expressed by scientific institutions.

A joint meeting of two commissions—on the nationality policy and interethnic relations, and on the questions of the development of culture, language, national and international traditions, and protection of historic heritage—discussed whether or not there should be a state law on languages.

The deputies criticized the draft law about languages of Soviet peoples and decided to form a special group that will continue work on this document. Prominent linguists and jurists will be involved in this work, in addition to deputies. It was decided to draw on foreign experience in the solution of interethnic language problems.

The committee on the work of soviets of people's deputies, development of government and self-government

discussed and on the whole approved the draft provision on rotation—the annual replacement of a fifth of the composition of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet envisaged by the country's constitution.

Important draft laws that are to ensure the legal basis for profound transformations in all areas of the country's life were discussed also by other permanent bodies of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Supreme Soviet 'Emotional' Debate Noted

PM1210125589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by parliamentary correspondents A. Davydov, V. Dolganov, and A. Stepovoy: "Force of Arguments or Argument of Force"]

[Text] They were perhaps the two most complex days in the work not only of the present session but also of our new parliament in general. The adoption of the law on the procedure for resolving collective labor disputes (conflicts) proceeded painfully and slowly, in fierce clashes of opinions, getting bogged down in written and oral amendments. And the next day was marked by an eruption of emotions in the hall of sessions and by the emergence on occasion of skirmishes and even (however regrettable it may be) by the transfer to nonparliamentary opinions. On several occasion A.I. Lukyanov, who was in the chair, made personal comments to deputies. At such moments order was restored but very soon the tense atmosphere of businesslike discussion was again swept by a wave of emotions.

Virtually all the people's deputies elected from Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast walked out of the session, dissatisfied with the information provided by L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. They sent the presidium a statement with their assessment of the situation in the explosive region....

In general during these 2 days the atmosphere which took shape at the session was often frankly that of a meeting. How and why did this happen?

Increasingly frequently we are coming up against individual groups of people, enterprise collectives, public organizations, and the population of entire oblasts and regions using the tactic of strong-arm pressure on the organs of power in resolving economic and social questions.

Attempts to "wring" a decision at any price by threatening "the total loss of voters' trust," citing "the people's opinion," seemingly known in advance to a particular speaker, have been made with respect to the USSR Supreme Soviet from the first days of its election. Many thousands of letters and telegrams, resolutions of meetings and strike committees, and appeals from citizens are reaching the session and individual deputies. Yes, a considerable proportion of the proposals and critical remarks are dictated by people's concern for the situation in the economy. But increasingly frequently (especially in collective missives) we are hearing, in the tone of an ultimatum: "We demand that the resolution be repealed immediately...", "the collective of our enterprise categorically demands...", "the meeting of chairmen of the city trade union committees warns...", "otherwise we shall be obliged...."

We shall not assert unequivocally that our parliament has "wavered" and is succumbing to emotional pressure exerted on it from both the right and the left. But there are grounds for such thoughts. The agenda is being deformed—during the work of the second session of the Supreme Soviet only one major law has so far been approved. On the other hand questions which contradict not only the initial plan but also work on a number of future draft laws are sometimes being submitted for examination. Among them we can include the discussion of the draft resolutions on additional measures to stabilize the consumer market and step up state control over prices and on introducing order in the trading and purchasing activity of cooperatives and the formation of prices for goods (services) sold by cooperatives to the population.

Serious questions, there is no denying. Millions of our compatriots live below or close to the poverty line. People's living standard is declining. The people's deputies have already repeatedly spoken of this with anxiety. Let us note, they have agreed that we should not give in to panic or underestimate or exaggerate our difficulties, that we must approach in a calm and balanced way the creation of laws which can cause the country's economy as a whole to recover and not patch it up yet again like blanket made of rags.

That is how it was in the process of the plenary sitting of the second session on 26 September, when there was a discussion of the draft law on amendments to the law on cooperatives. M.S. Gorbachev, who was in the chair and was supported by the majority of deputies at the time, suggested examining this draft law in a package with others. But this session was already examining the decision of the sixth All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] Plenum addressed to the Supreme Soviet with the categorical words: "The Plenum demands, the plenum states, the plenum appeals to the Supreme Soviet...." At the same time a group of deputies demanded that a number of cooperatives be closed and that the cooperative movement as a whole be restricted. The proposal did not go through.

But a meeting in support of the decisions of the sixth AUCCTU Plenum organized by the Moscow City Trade Unions Council was held in Luzhniki. Almost every speech at the meeting contained the words "put an end to the plundering cooperatives which are ruining the country and the people." And on the session's agenda for 9 and 10 October there appeared drafts included thanks largely to the AUCCTU's initiative.

But let's return to the thrust of the discussion. Alas, the already familiar meeting-type notes slipped into many speeches. "The people will not understand us...", "the people will not forgive us...", "we must consider the opinion of the multimillion mass of trade union members expressed in the AUCCTU plenum decisions..." As though oblivious of the need to approach economic questions from the positions of scientific lawmaking and the comprehensive solution of the problems of economic reform, Deputies S.A. Shalayev, G.I. Yanayev, and several others insisted on the adoption of resolutions which were rather in the nature of political declarations.

The tone of many speeches was such that People's Deputy S.G. Lushchikov noted from the session rostrum: "There are many references here to the people. But the rule-of-law state offers legal solutions. We are now experiencing euphoria from our power and it seems to us that we can cover everything and that the people have given us full powers to do so." Deputy Yu.A. Levykin expressed himself even more clearly: "I fear that we may subsequently be ashamed of the decisions taken in a hurry, in the heat of the moment, under the influence of emotions."

Were there grounds for such fears? Unfortunately, yes. While paying lip service to the development of cooperatives and new economic relations in general, many of those taking part in the discussion in fact fought for wilful administrative decisions, for the conservation of precisely that practice which has led the country to its present state in the economy. Too often the motivated, punctiliously well grounded proposals and arguments of one deputy was answered by the effective reply from another, obviously geared to television viewers.

For instance, deputies A.A. Sobchak, B.V. Miroshin, D.G. Smirnov, A.D. Sakharov, and A.I. Kazannik explain why the proposed draft resolutions contradict Soviet and international norms and show their authors' disrespect for the laws and Constitution of the USSR. But deputy B.N. Rogatin counters, with no particular digressions into the laws: "This is demanded by our entire country, by all our voters."

V.A. Tikhonov takes the floor. The well known economists recalls his speeches at the first session on the proposal to set up a system of effective struggle against any speculation—by the cooperatives, the state, or the trade unions... However many enemies we may seek, he says, you will not resolve our troubles that way. The reason lies in the actual economic system, in the fact that it is managed not by economic but administrative levers. But Deputy V.A. Yarin and others who follow him onto the rostrum seem not to hear this speech and continue to wind up the auditorium emotionally. The experienced innovatory economist M.A. Bocharov speaks in a reasoned way of the possible negative consequences of the struggle against the cooperatives. But a speaker who does not give his name (also a feature of these 2 days) repeats like a machine: We must "immediately halt the cooperative members and express parliament's attitude toward this ugly phenomenon before the eyes of the whole people." And so forth.

The point of the draft is not entirely understandable, Deputy V.A. Ivashko says in perplexity. Let us suppose the session approves it today, but what then about the law on cooperatives? Why waste time adopting "laws on laws" and "resolutions on resolutions?" Perfectly reasonable questions remain hanging in the air. On the other hand a categorical demand is immediately heard from G.I. Yanayev, who has already spoken: to vote immediately and by name. The numerous trips to the rostrum by S.S. Alekseyev, chairman of the committee for questions of legislation, legality, and law and order, did not introduce clarity on this occasion either. While agreeing that from the legal viewpoint the draft had little justification, he emphasized its moral aspect and the need to ease social tension in society.

Unfortunately, we did not hear the question: Will there be more meat, vegetables, soap, and detergents on the shelves as a result of this resolution?

We are not even trying to convey the precise chronology and sequence of the discussion, which ended with a decision unprecedented in world parliamentary practice: That the draft resolution proposed by the government be adopted as a basis... for elaborating a resolution with a consideration for deputies' proposals and comments. Surely they are not succeeding in putting our parliament on a bureaucratic track?

"It seems to me," People's Deputy V.N. Danilov, a railroad worker from the Ukraine, commented on the course of the discussion, "that we have been drawn into some political game prepared in advance. I think I am not the only one to fail to understand its point...."

We and the readers have probably already grown tired of talk about the standard, discipline, and tension of parliamentary work. While some people waxed emotional, argued, and defended their positions, which we may or may not share, some deputies here were actively... studying the periodical press.

Some people pressed their voting button mechanically, without thinking. Some people were completely absent. Yet after all the participation of any deputy in the discussion of the question can influence the quality of the decision taken. And we the voters have the right to expect each of our elected representatives to give fully of himself. Perhaps when all its members are gathered together our parliament will not be so compliant with regard to some "outside influences" and strong-arm arguments, whatever form they may take and in whatever lofty words they are expressed.

At any plenary sitting and in the committees and commissions much is being said today about the voters' credit of trust, about how it is not limitless. Not much time has been allowed for taking important decisions

which could drastically change the situation in the country. What will the continuation of work be like at the chambers' joint sittings 16 and 17 October?

Supreme Soviet News Conference on Railways

LD1210164189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1547 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 12 Oct (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports:

Soviet railroads should receive in 1990 13 percent more financial resources than is provided for by the drafts of the state plan and budget. This was the conclusion drawn by the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for Transport, Communications and Information Technology.

Addressing a news conference here today, its chairman, Valentin Tetenov, stressed that the need for additional allocations is connected with the priority significance of railroad transport for the development of the Soviet economy. The commission will convey its proposals to the Commission for Planning, Budget and Finance of the Soviet of the Union.

The deputies believe that these resources ought to be directed toward the construction of new lines, the expansion of railway stations and the modernization of rolling stock. A large portion of the resources—approximately R1.3 billion, should be used for resolving the sector's social problems. The raising of tariffs on freight transportation, while keeping prices unchanged for passengers, may be a source of additional allocations.

Valentin Tetenov noted that now a serious situation has evolved in railroad transport. The insufficient quantity of rolling stock has led to 25 million people not being able to use the services of the railroad in the summer months. The quality of freight transportation has also noticeably worsened.

USSR Minister of Railways Nikolay Konarev, who also took part in the press conference, pointed out the serious problems arising in the work of the railroad of the country due to the strikes and conflicts between nationalities. For instance, due to the strikes there was an 18-day interval in the movement of trains in Moldavia which had a negative effect on the work of the railroads of the whole southwest of the USSR. The violation of the schedule for the movement of freight trains throughout the country has led to over 2 million tonnes of cargo now accumulating at ports in the USSR. The minister stressed the inadmissibility of any actions directed at violating the normal work of the railroads.

Speaking of the situation on the railroads of Transcaucasia, Nikolay Konarev reported that the situation there is gradually normalizing. He noted that the improvement of the situation in the transport in this region is taking place without the bringing in of subunits of the Ministry of Defense or of additional contingents of internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

New Journal NARODNYY DEPUTAT Profiled

PM1210155589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "We Introduce the Journal NARODNYY DEPUTAT"]

[Text] This, from January 1990, will be the title of the sociopolitical problems and information journal of the USSR Supreme Soviet which is being created on the basis of the journal SOVETY NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV. It will be published 12 rather than 18 times a year.

It is not merely a question of changing the title. The main task of the journal NARODNYY DEPUTAT will be comprehensive coverage of key aspects of the theoretical and practical activities of the entire system of state power, propagandization and development of the Leninist principles of full power to the soviets, and the socialist self-management of the people.

The journal will be called upon to broadly and thoroughly reflect the lawmaking activity of the country's supreme organ of state power—the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the chambers' committees and commissions—and to contribute in every way to the strengthening of the real power of soviets at all levels. Its pages will serve as a mouthpiece for Soviet parliamentarians and deputies of all organs of state power. The journal will regularly publish the opinions and utterances of people's deputies on key problems of societal life, the work of the soviets, and, in particular, draft laws in preparation, including materials reflecting alternative approaches to the problems under discussion. Everyone will be able to share their proposals, wishes, fears, and joys, submit useful initiatives, and voice criticism irrespective of the personalities involved. The most sought-after authors and readers of the journal will be deputies, soviet officials, lawyers, activists, any citizen or voter who treasures state and public interests and cares about the concerns of organs of state power from the supreme to the rural level.

One of the journal's main themes will be questions of the theory and practice of Soviet building, implementation of the political and economic reform, transition of the republics and regions to economic independence and economic accountability, analysis of the practical work and dissemination of leading experience of soviets, deputies, public initiative organs, and activists. The journal will combine the publication of this kind of materials with up to date reactions to key events in state and social life. Readers will also find materials reflecting experience gained from parliamentary activities abroad, and in particular parliamentary activities in fraternal socialist countries. Close attention to current affairs is to be combined with an interest in the past and the history of the soviets. Methodological materials will be published side by side with articles on current affairs, legal consultations, and question-and-answer sessions.

So you will make the acquaintance of the journal NARODNYY DEPUTAT.

For readers' information: It will be difficult to buy the journal, only a few copies will be available in retail trade. The best way is to take out a subscription. Subscription is currently available without restrictions, delivery to take place as from January and in subsequent months of 1990. Applications for subscription are accepted at all post offices and organs of the Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter prior to the 12th of each month preceding the month in which the subscription comes into effect. The cost of subscription: R5, 40 kopeks per year; R2 70 kopeks per 6 months. The price of an individual copy is 30 kopeks.

Political & Social

Monitoring of NKAO Blockade Situation Continues

More Trains Arrive From Azerbaijan

LD1310120389 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Excerpts] Rail traffic has been fully restored from Azerbaijan to Armenia. For the first time since Azerbaijan lifted its economic blockade, 150 tankers with fuel arrived in Armenia. Food, building materials, and other freight are also being delivered to that Transcaucasian republic. [passage omitted] Our correspondent says 13 trains have reached Armenia via Azerbaijan in the past 24 hours, and the situation is yet to improve further. The traffic passing through Azerbaijan has to be guarded heavily.

Rail Traffic 'Completely Restored'

LD1210161189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1500 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Baku, 12 Oct (AZERINFORM-TASS)—The movement of freight trains from Azerbaijan to Armenia has been completely restored. Today, three trains with liquid cargoes passed through the junction stations linking these Transcaucasian republics. In them were railcars with gasoline and diesel fuel.

Today, by 1500 Moscow time, Azerbaijani railroad workers had given their colleagues over 150 tanks with fuel along the Yerevan section. Their conveyance began at the same time on the Tbilisi section of the railway. On a parallel with the fuel in both directions are wagons coming from Azerbaijan with foodstuffs, construction materials, structures, and other national economic freight.

As AZERINFORM told a correspondent, over 40 freight trains in the Azerbaijan railroad directorate have proceeded toward Armenia in the last day and a half—and this is above the norm. Workers at the Norashen and Idzhevan stations are working full time at this moment. That has made it possible to open up the movement of trains entering the region from the northern Caucasian main line.

According to the estimates of specialists, it is possible to convey daily to Armenia and Georgia, to the stations of Norashen and Beyuk-Kyasik, 20 and 40 trains respectively, as the schedule provides for. However, now considerably fewer are proceeding there. The railroad workers of Azerbaijan, on whose route several thousand wagons for the neighboring republics have accumulated, have the right to count on the assistance of their Georgian and Armenian colleagues.

Yerevan Argues Blockade Continues

NC1310135889 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2130 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Commentary by Amasya Ovanesyan: "Media Hoodwinking Is Continuing"]

[Text] The Moscow TV "Vremya" program again referred to the so-called "situation prevailing on the Transcaucasian railway" during its evening newscast yesterday, 11 October. This is the polite way the Moscow news agencies, and they are not the only ones, describe those reports pertaining to the blockade of Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] by the neighbouring republic.

Just for clarification it must be mentioned that the railroads belonging to the USSR Railways Ministry are divided into departmental administrations. The railways of Georgia and Armenia form the Transcaucasian railway, with its administrative center in Tbilisi. In fact, the present activity on the Armenian railways is more or less ensured by the Transcaucasian railway, which has an extremely limited capacity, and our Georgian friends are doing everything to extricate us to some extent from the grave situation. The Azerbaijan railway is a separate administrative unit. Therefore, the "Vremya" program should have at least mentioned the situation prevailing there. But apparently, as they say, calling things by their own names would lead to violent discontent in the neighbouring republic.

Mamedov, my esteemed colleague at Baku TV, stressed to union television viewers that the transportation of freight to Armenia is continuing normally. Then his interview with the chief of the Azerbaijan railway was aired. Mamedov asked him if he could confirm the reports that the freight arriving in Armenia has mostly been pillaged or destroyed. He expressed surprise. That official unabashedly stated that all this is being done before the trains enter Azerbaijani territory. So one should conjecture that it is being done in Russia. He also added that on Armenian territory itself the trains are coming under attack, and tried to create the impression that the Armenians are blockading themselves and are preventing the entry into Armenia of freight and fuel destined for the disaster area. Is this a joke or something? But let's go on. Next, the report prepared at Yeraskh

station on the same day by an Armenian TV reporter was aired. The report said that all in all a few trains had arrived with the usual vandalized prefabricated houses, pillaged equipment, and empty wagons; there were definitely no fuel containers.

This was followed by a report by a Moscow reporter from the USSR Railways Ministry. Minister Konarev revealed that that very day train traffic between Azerbaijan and Armenia had again been disrupted. He pointed out that the so-called Azerbaijan People's Front, which is virtually administering the railways of that republic, is to be blamed for this. Is this a joke? But wait—the real joke is still to come. As we said earlier, calling things by their proper names could lead to violent discontent on the part of the neighbouring republic. Therefore, fearing that, God forbid, comrades of the Azerbaijan People's Front might become disconcerted, to put it mildly, the "Vremya" moderator authoritatively announced after these three dispatches that according to an announcement just made the rail services between the two republics had fully resumed.

While he was still speaking I rang the Armenian branch of the Transcaucasian railways. The picture is the same: The blockade of disaster-stricken Armenia and the NKAO is continuing, condoned by the other fraternal republics, who remain silent.

As for the "Vremya" program's directionless and contradictory reports on "The NKAO and the Situation Around It" and the blockade of Armenia and Artsakh [NKAO], they no longer irritate me. Rather, as you know, it has been some time now since Moscow TV broadcast the Soviet satirist Aleksander Ivanov's popular laughter program. I personally missed that very much. Now the "Vremya" program is partially making up for the absence of that humorous program, thanks to its media hoodwinking.

Women, Children Put on Tracks

NC1310105889 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1700 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Rafik Grigoryan report from Yerevan train depot; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Rafik Grigoryan] Yesterday "Vremya" was at last able to report something closer to truth about the blockade. The USSR railways minister openly stated that the blockade is being implemented by the Azerbaijan Popular Front and that its members are putting women and children on the tracks in front of trains as a sacrificial offering. He said that it is impossible to remove them. This is hard to believe because nothing is impossible for the internal affairs troops. We know this from ample experience.

Thus, trains are arriving in Yerevan through Azerbaijan. I visited the Yerevan train depot to see about this and I spoke with Sasun Grigoryan, chairman of the production committee at the train depot.

Comrade Grigoryan, yesterday the "Vremya" program announced that the blockade has already been lifted and that the trains are arriving in Armenia through Azerbaijan carrying a full load. What do you have to say about that? What kind of trains are they? What freight do they carry and what is its condition? We are more interested in foodstuffs, fuel, and prefabricated houses for the earthquake victims.

[Sasun Grigoryan] Yes, Railways Minister Konarev's statement is (?in general) true. Trains are arriving in Armenia but the republic needs the foodstuffs and fuel that are not being received [words indistinct]. According to the figures for yesterday and this morning, 15 cars carrying foodstuffs, 29 cars of grains, 21 cars of benzine, 56 cars of construction material, 39 cars of prefabricated houses, 7 cars of liquid fuel, 4 cars of manufactured goods, and 5 cars [words indistinct] have been brought into Armenia from Norashen station [words indistinct].

The Yerevan train collective is doing everything not to leave any wagons idle in the Norashen station. Our drivers and crew have been threatened and terrorized and there was a case of firearm use in Norashen station. It is time to condemn those forces in the neighboring republic who have disrupted the flow of rail transport with their senseless acts.

[Rafik Grigoryan] [Word indistinct] train driver Levon Torumyan reported that he has just returned from the Norashen station bringing a train of 56 cars. Of them 4 were empty containers and the rest 50 closed cars, probably containing foodstuffs. Their content and condition will be known tomorrow. Today is no time to comment on it. We must look at the situation sensibly. The driver said that the members of the so-called Azerbaijan People's Front are on the sidings at the Norashen station and are deciding which freight to let through to Armenia. (?This is the question).

Two Soldiers Arrested

NC1210130989 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] On 10 October Soviet Army servicemen Dadarshev and Enverkaya were arrested and taken to the local militia department by the functionaries at the Interior Ministry's Megrinskiy rayon department and rayon procuracy. They came to Megri from the Nuvadi village of Azerbaijan and began firing an automatic weapon. It become obvious they had been dispatched to a small army unit near Nuvadi village.

Why did two servicemen from a unit deployed in Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic appear in Megrinskiy rayon center? The preliminary investigation revealed the following: Their commander had arranged for them to accompany a civilian car convoy while he himself remained in Nuvadi. (?Amanov), chairman of the collective farm, requested this service from the commander supposedly for security reasons, though the situation did not warrant it.

The rayon departments of the Interior Ministry do provide such escort upon request and in such a situation they are issued a document of mission. Dadarshev did not even carry Army identification documents with him. His bizarre appearance and unkempt dress created suspicion about his being a Soviet Army serviceman.

The situation became heated when the people of Megri saw the unknown servicemen in the car coming from Nuvadi. Naturally, they were asked who they really were. Dadarshev and Envarkaya could not give a convincing answer. Just then shots were heard. The rayon militia department functionaries found two home-made hand grenades while searching the cars. One must appreciate the rayon center and rayon's leadership's law enforcement procedures. The conflict was speedily suppressed.

Representatives of the Border Guard troops of the State Security Committee and subunits of the USSR Interior Ministry were invited to investigate also. By pure chance that incident did not turn into tragedy, said Colonel (?Gokorkov), representative of the troops of the USSR Interior Ministry, who came to the site of the incident.

The responsiblity here falls fully on the commanders of those army units in which Dadarshen and Enverkaya serve. First, that unit has been deployed in Nuvadi village for unknown reasons. I state this with all the responsibilities it entails. Second, such actions are purely arbitrary. The items found in the cars, carrying an automatic weapon, and using it in such a situation could be considered a criminal offense.

Konarev Speculates on Use of Force

PM1310132089 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Unnamed own correspondent report: "Who Suffers Losses as a Result of Interference by Extremists in the Operation of Transport"]

[Text] The movement of trains on the Azerbaijani railroad, which had resumed, came to a standstill for some time on 11 October. Interference by extremists once again led to a blockade of freight for Armenia. The operation of the railroad network in the European part of the country was thereby also paralyzed. And as a result of the criminal actions, in the course of the day Armenia and Georgia did not receive a single tonne of petroleum products via this main line. Some 52 fuel trains are standing idle. Food and petroleum products did not reach the inhabitants of Nagorno-Karabakh on that day, either.

The situation on the Transcaucasus railroads, which has deteriorated sharply in August and September, means that 33,400 freightcars, with their freight, are standing idle on the Azerbaijani railroad, and more than 21,000 on the rail network of the Yerevan division.

The USSR Ministry of Railways was forced to change the system of organizing shipments. Freight for Armenia is now sent via an already overloaded line, the Tuapse-Tbilisi line. The railmen have been forced to redirect some oil trains by a roundabout route of 1,500 km. The supply of food and oil to the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic is still going mainly via Georgia. For a republic that has experienced an earthquake and needs priority services, the blockade is doubly dangerous. Azerbaijan is also reaping the fruit of extremism. The Caspian oilmen, for instance, urgently need oil tanker trains.

This was discussed at a briefing held yesterday at the USSR Ministry of Railways. How to restore normal train traffic on all sectors of the Transcaucasian railroads was discussed here. The USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Urgent Measures To Ensure Uninterrupted Functioning of Railroad Transport and Basic Sectors of the National Economy" has an unequivocal answer to this: All organs of state management are to adopt resolute and effective measures.

I asked N. Konarev, USSR minister of railways, for his view on the participation of servicemen in overcoming the blockade on the Transcaucasian railroads.

This was his reply:

"Troops should be used only in an emergency. Provision is made for them to guard individual sectors and facilities vital to the operation of the railroads, as well as bridges and tunnels, and to ensure the safety of transport workers and citizens. I think that this will be the only participation by servicemen. I repeat: We will ask the Army for help only in exceptional cases, if unforeseen circumstances arise. In general the resolution of the urgent problems of Transcaucasia depends on skillful collaboration between the party and soviet organs of Azerbaijan and Armenia and an assertive position on their part, rather than a wait-and-see attitude."

NKAO Official Calls for Plebiscite

NC1210161089 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 11 Oct 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] Under the headline "This Blockade Will Not Subjugate the People of Artsakh" [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO)], YEREKOYAN YEREVAN has published an interview with Maksim Mirzoyan, chairman of the Stepanakert city soviet executive committee, and Grant Melkonyan, second secretary of the party city committee.

The situation in the NKAO is getting worse because the supreme powers are not making an unequivocal political assessment of the NKAO problem and the related events, says Grant Melkonyan. He adds that the essence of the problem is being falsified. The blockade is a new Sumgait; it is a political and economic diversion. The brigands (?on the roads) are enjoying immunity and freedom and are carrying out instructions from above; yes, from above, he declares.

In reply to a reporter's question, Maksim Mirzoyan says that the way out of the present situation is to hold a plebiscite in the NKAO. The problem should be solved by political means in line with the wishes of the population of Artsakh, and that means the oblast's unification with mother Armenia. The postponement of the problem will not help; rather, it will further aggravate the situation.

NKAO Congress Appeals to Azerbaijan

NC1310112089 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] The congress of the plenipotentiary representatives of the residents of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] reminds the Azerbaijan people in its appeal of Karl Marx's famous words that a nation which suppresses another nation is not free.

In the case of Azerbaijan, this Marxist truth is necessary not only in a general political sense. By not comprehending or not willing to comprehend the ethnic problem of the Artsakhian Armenians [Armenians residing in NKAO] and by rejecting its right of self-determination, the Azerbaijani people are placing them in an unfree and physically and morally enslaved situation.

The truth is that in suppressing the movement of the Artsakhian Armenians for free self-determination and for joining the motherland, the ethnic extremists and their accomplices are using the Azerbaijani people as a mere tool of the republican leadership.

By instigating religious intolerance and anti-Armenian fanaticism, sinister forces are turning them into an unruly mob and using them as a striking force in all the anti-Armenian operations, from genocide and forced displacement, to the plunderings and the blockade.

"Vremya" Reporting Termed 'False'

NC1310085789 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Urgent report]

[Text] The "Vremya" program on central USSR TV continues its false and ambiguous reporting, thus confusing the millions of TV viewers in our country and abroad.

Yesterday "Vremya" devoted a (?feature) to the Azerbaijan blockade of Armenia. Even though the report from Azerbaijan was read in full, the report received from Armenia was incomplete and contained nothing, as a result of intentional deletions.

The "Vremya" correspondent's (?interview) in Azerbaijan with Azerbaijan's deputy minister of railways tried to veil realities and painted a false picture of the situation. From their conversation, the viewer concluded that the Azerbaijanis are doing everything to help Armenia but that it is the Armenians in Megrinskiy rayon at (Karjivan) station who are stopping and obstructing activities. It was also implied that trains en route to Armenia are stoned until they enter Azerbaijan.

Immediately after this, the Armenian Yeraskh railway station was shown and it was said that it is true that the trains arrived, but with plundered and destroyed (?cargo).

I do not think that the "Vremya" feature's Armenian correspondent Vladimir Nazaryan reported clearly how the wagons arrive in Armenia, their contents, and on the condition of the cargo. However, the very sharp scissors did their job; and this is why the televiewers did not understand the scope of the blockade, or whether Azerbaijan is implementing the decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet on improving transportation.

However, PRAVDA, tired of the habit of veiling truths for years, today carried a true and informative report on the situation of the trains passing through Azerbaijan. In an interview at the USSR Ministry of Railways, Minister Nikolay Konarev said that 220 wagons for Armenia are standing on the northern Caucasus-Southern-Donetsk-[name indistinct]-Azerbaijan-Transcaucasus line. The reason for this is the intervention by the Azerbaijani extremists who are not allowing the cargo destined for Armenia to be carried by the Azerbaijani rail.

This is the truth. However, let us examine the "Vremya" report gleaned from reports received from Azerbaijan and Armenia. The TV reporter victoriously declared that the route to Armenia is completely open.

In order to prove this, today we contacted Avak Khachatryan, secretary of the Yerevan branch railway party organization. He stated that since 1800 last night until this morning, only 11 wagons instead of 25 have arrived in Armenia from Azerbaijan. Does this mean that the "Vremya" report continues to lie? Definitely. It should be frankly stated that the constructors who have come from all the republics of the USSR—with the exception, of course, of Azerbaijan—for the reconstruction of the Armenian quake damages do not have any construction material and have to leave since there is no fuel in Armenia even for the first aid car, since the prefabricated houses sent for the quake victims are arriving in a damaged state, since the Azerbaijani ruffians are not being punished, and since the contemporary Turkish Yenicheris are being equated to the Armenians who have risen to defend their historic rights.

Apparently, the "Vremya" feature has lost its sense of time. We believe that the "Vremya" journalists are not naive and slow-witted. They can present white as black, and black as white. In other words, they can do whatever they want to. What is left is to clearly state that "Vremya" does not have a personal view and that it is dictated from above.

TASS Report Data Criticized

PM1310134589 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 30 Sep 89 p 2

[AZERINFORM report: "Who Do the Lies Serve?"]

[Text] On 25 September PRAVDA published a TASS report from Stepanakert entitled "Situation in Karabakh" which cited a number of facts which do not accord with reality. In particular, in analyzing the plight of agriculture in the autonomous oblast, L. Petrosyan, chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] agroindustrial committee, asserts: "We have managed to obtain just one-tenth of the 6-month stock of concentrated feed. The livestock remain unfed for the second week running and the unplanned slaughter of animals has begun at the pig-rearing complexes. An AZERINFORM correspondent asked R. Dzhamilov, Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] minister of grain products, to comment on the statements of the oblast agro-industrial committee leader.

"In the first half of this year the collective farms [kolkhozes], state farms [sovkhozes], and other state farms of the Azerbaijan SSR's Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast received nearly 18,000 tonnes of concentrated feed, or 97.4 percent of the planned stock. As for the unfed livestock then of course it is the strikers who are to blame for that—and as is well known a general strike was declared in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast as of 3 May this year—rather than the workers of the system of the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Grain Products and the transport workers. Incidentally, soldiers have had to process most of our freight reaching the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

"Nor can we keep quiet about the fact that although the autonomous oblast has been provided with concentrated feed in accordance with the stocks earmarked for it, the USSR State Planning Committee (the first deputy chairman is S.A. Sitaryan), in contravention of the well-known CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, is trying, without coordinating the matter with our ministry or the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers, to remove the stocks for the second half of the year for the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from the Azerbaijan SSR and pass them on to the Ukrainian Ministry of Grain Products," the minister noted.

Several other facts were also conveyed in a distorted, frankly unobjective form in the correspondence. It is absolutely clear that these reports in no way promote the normalization of the situation in the region but on the contrary stoke still further the already heated passions.

The ministry workers have written a collective letter to PRAVDA about everything set forth above.

'No Improvement' in Crime Situation

PM1210130789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 p 1

[V. Byrkin report: "Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO). 11 October"]

[Text] For a number of reasons the important decision adopted by the supreme organ of power has not taken effect. Despite the adoption of the USSR Supreme Soviet's resolution to end the blockade of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic and the NKAO, the autonomous oblast is still held in the grip of that blockade. And although freight trains have begun arriving at Stepanakert train station, they haven't brought the most important and essential things—food and gasoline.

Nor is there any improvement in the crime situation in and around the NKAO. After the blowing up of a highway bridge near Stepanakert during the night of 7 October, which left three rayons cut off from the oblast center, and the attempts to blow up another bridge on the Agdam to Martuni railway line on the night of 10 October all the most important communications facilities on the NKAO's territory have been taken under the protection of internal troops. Remote villages in the oblast have been attacked and fired on frequently.

After the confiscation of a large consignment of weapons in a helicopter belonging to the Armenian Civil Aviation Administration, which has already been reported in the press, there have now been new cases not as significant as that but no less alarming. Even foreign-made weapons are being confiscated, as happened in Shusha on 5 October, when a foreign-made revolver was discovered during an interrogation at the home of N. Dzhafarov, an inhabitant of Lachinskiy Rayon. The report of the Special District command states that citizen R.Z. Sadykov was killed in the course of his arrest: After being interrogated and having his rifle confiscated he knocked down a soldier and tried to escape in a car.

The Special District command continues to receive reports that shots have been fired and stones thrown at vehicles and tractors working in the fields. On the evening of 10 October in Stepanakert there was an incident between military servicemen and the local population. Stepanakert resident S. Akopyan was killed and five others were injured. Servicemen were also hurt.

...On 10 October Stepanakert bade farewell with flowers and wreaths to Oleg Zhikhor, a gas industry foreman. (KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA wrote about O. Zhikhor in the 5 October issue). Yet another unnecessary casualty of the protracted interethnic conflict....

Yerevan Party Official on Effects

LD1210135489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Yerevan under the blockade—sorry, Yerevan and the blockade: An interview with (Polonez) Daniilovich Danyelyan secretary of the Yerevan city party committee.

[Begin Danyelyan recording] The blockade has had a tangible effect on the provision of vital supplies for the population of our city. Shop shelves have become noticeably emptier. Bread lines are forming. Pasta, matches, and other goods are unavailable. Passenger transport has been paralyzed. Agricultural produce almost entirely fails to reach the city. During the days of the blockade, the daily supplies of agricultural produce have decreased from 1,200 to 200 tonnes, which has caused market prices to rise considerably.

Losses are being sustained by practically all branches of the national economy in the republic. As far as the industry of Yerevan alone is concerned, production losses, measured against the enterprises' production programs, have, amounted to approximately R130 million over the period since the blockade began. The working people's wages have gone down by R6.5 million. There is a R17 million shortfall in the profits plan. Owing to the fact that there is a shortfall in the supply of construction materials, housing construction has practically been suspended in the town, and this in the capital of the republic where approximately 1 million people have no roof over their heads.

The measures we have been and are taking have failed to yield results so far. Moreover, our partners suffer, too. Finished goods, piled up in warehouses, cannot reach the customer because of the blockade. In particular, already more than 7 million standard cans of foodstuffs, 500,000 pairs of footwear, and R 2.5 million or so worth of furniture have failed to be delivered to the cities of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk; to the Baltic republics; and the regions of the extreme north and Far East.

There is no possibility of dispatching more than 1,000 motor vehicles and 25,000 vehicle tires, along with a considerable quantity of large electrical machines, transformers, pumps, metalworking machine tools, and components, and this naturally will affect the material well-being of the working people in many other regions of the country, as well.

Nonetheless, we are confident that the question will be resolved and that the country's supreme authorities wil bring to heel those who inspire, organize, execute, and advocate this immoral action. [end recording]

Armenian NKAO Official on Blockade

NC1210133189 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Excerpts] Stepanakert, 11 Oct (ARMENPRES)—The latest TASS report on developments in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] in general reflected the degree of tension in the interethnic relations in the region. No day goes by without unlawful acts being committed, with innocent people suffering in various degrees. [passage omitted]

Semyon Papayan, a member of the NKAO Special Administration Committee, told ARMENPRES: The escalation of tension in the region is the direct result of the superficial approach to the NKAO problem, and further exacerbated by the continuing blockade. The NKAO has not received flour, fuel, medicine, and composite feed for a long time.

Foodstuff is brought to us by helicopter from Armenia and Georgia. The Azerbaijan Republic sends smashed equipment and glassware and sometimes empty wagons to the local train station. Apparently Azerbaijan has in fact decided to terrorize the NKAO with a threat of impending starvation. This evinces a lack of seriousness. In their more than 2000-year-old history the people of Artsakh [NKAO] have experienced many such trials. One should not provide them with such (?concoctions) as alleged Armenian extremism and Azerbaijani humanism. The people know the facts and have no intention of becoming resigned to its goals.

S. Papayan added that at present the Special Administration Committee—whose activities are also not to the liking of the Azerbaijanis—is trying to provide the people with foodstuffs, the necessary goods to keep the work pace going and to mitigate the tense emotions.

Another cause for concern is that the supplies of the manufacturing enterprises, in particular electrical equipment and furniture factories, are bulging with manufactured goods that are impossible to ship to the customers. How long will this abnormal situation continue? The country's Supreme Soviet must give an urgent reply to this question. I think that the session must give immediate consideration to unblocking the roads since all the datelines given for Azerbaijan have expired.

Emergency Measures Called for

PM1210135389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kaushanskiy, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent: "Trains on the Move, But Problems Remain"]

[Text] We had barely come to a halt in the Azerbaijan rayon center of Kazakh before our vehicle was surrounded by a small group of people, mainly young people.

"Could you tell us if it is true that soldiers have been brought in to guard the railway?" a young man in the crowd was interested to know.

This was followed by another question on the same subject. And another. Possibly no other government document of recent days has attracted so much attention as the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Urgent Measures To Ensure the Uninterrupted Functioning of Railroad Transport and Basic Sectors of the National Economy." Particularly the second clause—the emergency clause.

But how are people's questions to be answered? Before I set off on the road, Lieutenant General V. Samsonov, chief of staff of the Transcaucasus Military District, had responded very laconically to my telephone call: "We are military people. As long as we have orders, we have work."

The implication behind the general's words was clear: Is it really up to the military to act as arbiter in every fresh outburst of interethnic feeling and would it not be better if the two peoples concerned were to return to civilized relations? It was in this spirit that I answered the young man who had asked the question.

"If the military come..." he began, looking round to see whether he had a large audience. But he was prevented from continuing by an old man with several days' gray stubble on his face, who stepped forward.

"That's enough now.... Take a look at me. I'm 67 years old. My wife is Armenian, I've lived with her all my life, and we've produced three children. Where are they all now? My wife has remained in Armenia, my children have gone to seek refuge in Russia, and I have been left without a roof over my head in my old age. Is that not enough?"

The old man's lips had begun to quiver, while the young man, who had muttered as an afterthought that there are just as many Azerbaijanis and Armenians living together as there are fighting each other, withdrew.

But that is not true, I wanted to say to him. I served for several years in Baku and fell in love with this city, with its wonderful little back yards in which Azerbaijani and Armenian speech alternated and where neighbors were closer to one another than blood relatives, gathering for weddings, in honor of the birth of a child, or just to exchange news and take pleasure in the successes of children and grandchildren. This world of little yards, this brightly colored, friendly world of many faces has now been smothered, like a bonfire extinguished by an evil hand. Who is to blame for this? In what camp are yesterday's neighbors: friend or foe?

Shortly after the earthquake in Armenia I visited Baku for several days and saw the eyes of local railroad workers, red from lack of sleep, giving the "green light" at any time of day or night to trains on their way to the neighboring republic. And not a murmur about the discord surrounding Karabakh....

And now, at last, the first reports that trains are moving again between Azerbaijan and Armenia. It would be wonderful to be able to breath a sigh of relief and report that the wisdom of the two peoples has triumphed, that their disputes have been resolved, and that, merrily clattering over the rails, the trains are back on schedule and doing something toward closing the yawning breach in the region's economy—the breach caused by the nonappearance of 32,000 railroad cars carrying food, fuel, and construction materials in Armenia in August and September. I will immediately point out that it is still extremely premature to cast oneself on the wave of optimism.

At the very time when reports were appearing in the newspapers about railroad traffic getting back to normal, I just managed to catch Major General M. Surkov, USSR people's deputy, in Yerevan on his way to the airport to fly out for the USSR Supreme Soviet session. Usually smiling and pleasant, this time Mikhail Semenovich was restrained and somewhat curt:

"This is what I am going to say on behalf of my electorate at the session—if I am given the microphone, of course," he slapped the palm of his hand down on a pile of papers in a file. "You can jot down the latest figures: At present 13,000 tonnes of rolled metal and 4,000 tonnes of pipeline intended for Leninakan are at a standstill on the track in Azerbaijan. A total of 1,180 railroad cars have failed to turn up in this city alone. To date, losses incurred by the Leninakan zone stand at R16 million, which includes R12.2 million in wages...."

The ice has begun to break, but the reports on railroad traffic put one in mind of reports from the front. The emphasis in these reports is not so much on the number of railroad cars that have reached their destination as on what they have actually brought. If we are going to use military terminology, it is a question of the structure of freight along the axis of the main thrust—in other words, freight intended for the earthquake zone.

"Yesterday we received eight trains, tonight we were given another seven, and they have promised to increase their efforts," A. Kandilyan, chief of the Yerevan branch of the Transcaucasus Railroad, glanced at his notebook and, tiredly passing his hand across his face, which showed all the signs of chronic lack of sleep, remarked: "But...But where on earth is the fuel, where is the cement? This would immediately speed up the restoration work."

He walked over to the window of his vast office, lifted the blind, and looked at the leaden clouds: "Can you feel winter in the air?"

We were keenly aware of winter in the air 2 hours later in Leninakan, high up in the hills. There had been torrential rain for 3 days in succession and we literally had to wade through knee-deep mud to get to the trailer that

serves as the headquarters of the construction workers from Chelyabinak. The sector foreman, V. Tokmakov, interrupted a conference and said, without hiding his emotion:

"We are doing more standing about than actually working, but it is not our fault: We have nothing to reinforce the planking with. As soon as we get cement people will be willing to work all night. It is paradoxical: Two railroad cars carrying cement are standing just 15 kilometers away, but it is impossible to get them here because there is no gasoline. We held a party meeting here the other day, where it was decided to hang on and not leave the zone under any circumstances. We are grateful to our people in the Urals: They have assigned us R5.4 million to compensate our wages fund."

Military construction workers from Belorussia are neighbors of the Urals workers. Their mood is slightly better: They have just completed another house. But even here there is a fly in the ointment. "A train carrying sanitary ware left Minsk bound for here on 7 July, but...it never arrived," Lieutenant Colonel A. Gerasimovich, chief of the production department of the chief of works administration, told us. "A second batch had to be flown here on an IL-76. The flight was truly out of this world, because it cost us almost R40,000. Should the railroads be guarded by the military? No, I am against that idea. Is Karabakh relevant to the grief of those people who have been left homeless?"

Indeed, is Karabakh relevant to the unavailability of tiles in the military trade network that are needed for the new settlers who have suffered much and long enough? Are "border" claims relevant to the absence of potatoes in the same military trade network, 200 tonnes of which Kazan pledged to supply but has not done so yet, because there are no guarantees that the trains will not be left in a siding somewhere, where the freight will happily rot, as has happened more than once already? And what is the relevance here of learned explanations in the local press as to who were the first settlers in the ancient land of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast?

The trains are running again and all the central newspapers have begun to be printed on Yerevan's own printing presses.... These slight improvements ought to be a source of joy. But it must be admitted that the sense of bitterness outweighs everything else. Why have so much time, so many resources, and so much nervous energy been lost?

It is now important not only to ponder every line in the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution and take effective emergency measures on this basis. Today people in Armenia and Azerbaijan must ask themselves the question which their kinsmen have asked one another since time immemorial: "Quo vadis?"—"Where are you going?" This question is certainly not concerned with geography but with morality: Which moral values will you choose to be guided by, which bank do you intend to make for—that of stubborn intolerance which incinerates the soul or that of charity, cooperation, and willingness to resolve all of life's problems in the spirit of civilization and interest in the common fate?

The answer seems clear to me.

Voskanyan Criticizes Central Authorities

NC0610162289 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 5 Oct 89

[Excerpts] Yerevan, 5 Oct (ARMENPRES)—The second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet resumed its deliberations on Monday 2 October. [passage omitted]. The economic and rail situation was discussed at the evening session. [passage omitted]

G. Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium, addressed the session on behalf of the deputies from Armenia. He said that during the first working day of our session the people's deputies from Armenia proposed an urgent discussion of the economic blockade of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and Armenia by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. We (?demanded) a political evaluation of that inhuman and illegal action and urgent measures to lift the blockade.

A week has gone by but calls for reason have yielded no results and promises of resolute actions within a few days have not been kept. [passage omitted].

The blockade of the Armenian SSR and NKAO are incompatible with the treaty on the formation of the USSR and with the USSR Constitution. Contemporary international law regards the blockade as an act of war and aggression. It is time to declare to everyone that that action, unprecedented in its extent and severity, is shaking the foundations of the Soviet federation and is dealing a blow to the country's international image. [passage omitted].

Recently the blockade has been refined. Almost nothing has come in since the partial opening of the Azerbaijan railroad on 25 September. Armenia received only freight of rotten foodstuffs, selected on purpose; prefabricated houses and equipment that had been destroyed; and water-filled wagons carrying cement, gravel, and sand. Not a single container of fuel has been delivered. On 30 September the Azerbaijani side again closed the roads leading to Armenia. The republic's entire economic activity has almost disintegrated. Construction and restoration work in the the earthquake area is disrupted. Foodstuffs and manufactured goods are not allowed through. Armenia is deprived of the possibility of dispatching its products to consumers in the country, which in turn prevents the republic from fulfilling its contracts.

The extreme carelessness of the central authorities and union bodies in this perilous situation is causing misgivings and indignation in the Armenian people and in all noble people in the country.

Instead of taking the most resolute measures to unblock the rails and the roads, they look for abstract proof to justify that action. Those claims that the blockade of Armenia was a counteraction do not fit the facts, because anyone familiar with geography realizes that such a thing is impossible. The continuation of the policy of evening out the guilt is a bankrupt policy, totally distorting the true picture.

We officially declare that no incidents aimed at disrupting the regular commuting of trains on Armenian SSR territory, including the ones going to Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, are being allowed. The economic blockade of the Armenian SSR is the logical continuation of the methodically implemented policy of coercion and political terror with one aim in mind: to force a democratic solution to the NKAO problem into impasse. [passage omitted]

The people's deputies from the Armenian SSR support Deputy V. Kolesnikov's proposals and consider it necessary:

1. To give a political assessment and condemn the blockade as an inhuman and illegal act impermissible in the relations of the republics of Soviet Union.

2. To take urgent measures to protect the rights of the Armenian SSR which are the USSR's responsibilities and which are envisaged by the union treaty and Constitution

3. To instruct the USSR procuracy to identify and to call to strict account the instigators, organizers, and executors of the blockade of Armenian SSR.

4. To ask the USSR Council of Ministers for compensation of the losses incurred by the Armenian SSR as a result of the blockade from the budget of the Azerbaijan SSR.

In conclusion, G. Voskanyan said that keeping silent and evading a political assessment of the blockade are tantamount to encouraging aggression. [passage omitted].

New NKAO-Armenia Air Link Opened

NC1310150989 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 9 Oct 89

[Text] Kamo, 9 Oct (ARMENPRES)—The new air link connecting the Sevan basin with Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] has started operations. It was opened in order to provide a shorter air route to supply foodstuffs and vital necessities to the population of the oblast, which is under blockade.

The flights are using the Kamo-Gadrut-Gedashen-Mardakert-Shaumyan route established by the USSR Civil Aviation Ministry. Within a short period nearly 2,000 people and more that 20 tonnes of freight have been transported. Goods such as flour, butter, sugar, soap, medicine, and other items bought by the humanitarian charity organization and the contributions of the citizens, organizations, and enterprises have been airlifted to Artsakh. Soon, 150 tonnes of flour and other foodstuffs will be airlifted on the instructions of the charity organization.

Airport Chief Nver Krnadyan told an ARMENPRES correspondent that the airport had made meticulous preparations for this mission. The necessary fuel supplies were stocked up beforehand. Through collective efforts a radio station was set up in the village rayon of Gedashen which has [word indistinct] stable radio link between the (?helicopter) and Kamo airport.

The republic's aviation administration has provided us with a 22- seat MI-8 helicopter, which is successfully accomplishing the flights, Krnadyan stated. For example, for every one or two daily flights by each helicopter from Yerevan we are able to fly twice more from Kamo, because of the short flying distance. I think that the assistance would have been more substantial if we had been allocated two helicopters. In the present tense situation a helicopter is more useful because it is extremely flexible and reliable and particularly suitable, given Artsakh's mountainous nature, as it can land anywhere, he concluded.

Medics Issue Appeal on Armenian Quake Victims

PM1110083989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[ARMENPRESS-TASS report: "Doctors' Appeal"]

[Text] Yerevan, 6 Oct—A joint session of the collegiums of the USSR and Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic ministries of health has been held here involving representatives of all the union republics to examine the question of doctors' participation in the earliest restoration and development of the material and technical basis of health care in Armenia and the provision of medical aid to thousands of inhabitants in the disaster zone.

The session adopted an appeal to all the country's medical workers and to all people helping to clear up the aftereffects of the earthquake. The appeal notes that the situation in the earthquake zone and the course of work are causing great concern for the fate of the hundreds of thousands of inhabitants left homeless and without worthwhile medical assistance. The repair of health care facilities is proceeding only slowly. The pace of construction and repair work is affected by the unsatisfactory supply of building materials.

The participants in the session appealed to all the country's medical workers, the public, to every honorable worker, and to Azerbaijan's railroad workers to do everything in their power to ensure the unhindered and safe passage and delivery of freight and to contribute to the revival of the republic's afflicted rayons.

Demonstrations Protest Armenians in USSR Army

NC1310095389 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Discharged soldiers, conscripts, and parents are continuing their sit-in demonstrations at the Yerevan Theater Square that they started several weeks ago. Everyone understands their anxiety. A persecution campaign has started against the Armenian soldiers in the Soviet Army, and this often leads to clashes and victims.

The situation of the Armenian soldiers in the Army has deteriorated so much, and their destiny has become so acute, that the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet approved during its last session an appeal addressed to the USSR Supreme Soviet calling for substantial guarantees for the security of the Armenian soldiers serving in Army units. However, all these have not had any objective results.

Deputies Discuss New Constitutional Provisions

PM1210141189

[Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 October 1989 publishes on page 2 under the "Our Personal Opinion" rubric a feature entitled "I Have the Right: Questions and Answers Regarding the USSR Constitution." The feature, compiled by Sergey Drozdov, a student gaining professional experience on the newspaper, comprises an account of his own reservations about the present Soviet Constitution and answers to two questions put by him to four USSR people's deputies who are members of the Constitutional Commission. Question Two—"What provisions primarily need, in your view, to be introduced into the new draft Constitution?"—is answered by the deputies as follows.

K.S. Khallik, leading scientific staffer at the Estonian Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law:

"First, clearly stipulated legal bases for the relations between the state and the citizen should form the fundamental basis of the new constitution.

"Everything that stems from specific social policy, utopian dreams, and unrealizable promises should be removed from the Constitution.

"Second, I think that the new Constitution should include a real treaty of union containing a Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of the USSR. The guaranteed rights of all nations to self-determination should be defined. The point of a treaty of union is not that central power should authorize or forbid something to members of the federation, but that federation members voluntarily reach agreement about everything that comes within the ambit of common interests."

Academician and Nobel Prize winner Andrey Sakharov:

"The Constitution must not be patched up. The present Constitution should be completely changed. A fundamentally new Constitution which reflects the following provisions is essential:

"The Soviet Union is a voluntary association of republic-states on the basis of a new treaty of union and the principle of the self-determination of nations.

"There should be no nations and national-territorial formations of different sorts and levels in our country. The republic should be the sole national-territorial unit.

"It is essential to reflect decentralizaion and pluralism in the economy, culture, ideology—in all spheres.

"Equality of various forms of ownership: state, republic, cooperative and private ownership.

"Land and its resources are the property of the republic. Land is transferrable to the indefinite ownership of cooperatives and private persons with the right of inheritance. The republic has the right to authorize the sale of land to them.

"It is essential to eliminate Article 6 of the 1977 Constitution and have nothing akin to it if the Constitution is not to be merely a scrap of paper."

Yu.V. Golik, dean of Kemerovo University Law Faculty:

"The Constitution should be aimed at ensuring man's well-being [zhizneobespecheniye]. The state, society, and the collective are all secondary. The main thing is man and his life. And I would therefore first start working on a document, let us call it a bill of rights. Or, in other words, A Law on Human Rights."

A.A. Sobchak, doctor of juridical sciences and professor at Leningrad University:

"I think that the new Constitution should be fundamentally different. It should not resemble its predecessors even purely externally in terms of the structure of the articles and chapters. The main thing to do, of course, is enshrine the relations of ownership. And ownership by the citizen should be regarded as of paramount importance.

"Furthermore, we should provide a political system for the exercise of power in a fundamentally new way. From this standpoint, it is necessary first and foremost to revise Article 6, which has allowed a system of parallel power to be created within the state in the shape of party organs which decide everything but are legally accountable for nothing."

Alekseyev Comments on Party's Role

PM0610191189

[Editorial Report] Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 October 1989 front-pages under the headline "The People's Lot and Happiness" a 1,400-word interview with People's Deputy S.S. Alekseyev, chairman of the

USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, by T. Boykova, published to mark USSR Constitution Day. Alekseyev criticizes the existing constitution as "chiefly declarative," says that the new constitution must be that of "democratic, humane socialism," and notes the tremendous amount of work that its drafting will entail. The interview includes the following passage relating to the article of the Constitution which speaks of the CPSU's status in society:

"[Boykova] What can you say about cardinal changes in specific articles? For instance, what about Article 6—'The Communist Party...is the leading and guiding force....'

"[Alekseyev] I think that this article, along with many others, will be amended. The party must function as the vanguard of the people, and not as a force exercising direct management of absolutely everything, as the text of the present Constitution implies."

Akhromeyev Denies 'Collusion' With U.S. on Baltics

LD1210194489 Moscow TASS in English 1911 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Riga October 12 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev:

Visiting Riga on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the city's liberation from Nazi invaders, Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, USSR people's deputy, said today that civilised methods should be used against political adversaries.

Akhromeyev expressed his disagreement with statements of the People's Front which envisage Latvia's secession from the Soviet Union. At the same time, he noted that in conditions of democracy and glasnost there is room for such political views.

"This is a normal state of our society. But Communists should struggle against their political adversaries by civilised methods—debating, persuading people".

"Because of historic conditions, many people in the Baltic Republics have seen the causes of injustice mainly in the actions of the Russian people," Akhromeyev said.

"But this wave is ebbing now, and a more correct view of history and present-day reality emerges. We must be patient and conduct the quest for mutual understanding," he said.

Akhromeyev flatly denied rumours circulated in Latvia about collusion between Moscow and the U.S. Administration regarding the Baltic Republics. "This is a slander. Never and under no conditions can there be such an arrangement," Akhromeyev said.

Roundtable on Lithuanian Communist Party Held

LD1210183789

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 12 October broadcasts a 25-minute program presented by Lithuanian radio commentator Benas Rupeika from the hall of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

Rupeika states that the plenum will continue its work tomorrow. During the lunch break Rupeika invites several members of the Central Committee plenum for roundtable talks. They are Romanas Songaila, the party leader from Mazeikiai; Kestutis Zaleckas, first party secretary of the Vilnius city party committee; Rimantas Purtulis, a production worker from Panevezys Ekranas enterprise; and Mindaugas Stakvilevicius, first party secretary of Siauliai city party committee. Rupeika says: "Algirdas Brazauskas said at the plenum today that we could not stop now, by no means. And yet, perhaps we can, after the telephone conversation with Gorbachev today. So, let us have a discussion today. And here is yet another A. Brazauskas thought voiced today: "That the Lithuanian Communist Palrty cannot and must not split. I was rather surprised when Mindaugas Stakvilevicius said that he was against election competition between the party and Sajudis: We must think about Lithuania and not the posts in the administration, he said. Another of his thoughts which I noted was, that if a tension between Moscow and Vilnius, that is, between the Lithuanian Communist Party and the CPSU occurs an alternative such as a conference can be found; a conference with the rights of a congress; it is not only necessary to clean up the content of the Central Committee, but the apparatus of the Central Committee as well, said M. Stakvilevicius.

M. Stakvilevicius: "Perhaps I did not say exactly this. First, concerning the conference I said that this opinion concerning the conference was voiced at the Siauliai Teachers' Training College in February."

"The most important issues could be solved at a conference in December or even earlier than that. And these would be:

"1. To restructure the Central Committee; to reelect the bureau and the Central Committee because most of the members of the Central Committee are not capable of solving a great number of problems. I apologize for saying that there should be more brave and wise people there in the Central Committee.

2. A statement should be made concerning the new party program and the status at the conference. And this statement should be less declarative so that we would not look like we are competing with other as to who would be the first to speak about the secession of Lithuania."

On the Lithuanian Communist Party relations with the CPSU Stakvilevicius says: "We will write in our statute, or the program, that we are independent, or we can declare that we are independent, but if we have pawns at

the Central Committee or the bureau, I am sorry, we will not have the desired independence for the Lithuanian Communist Party." Rupeika states: "Pickets will be waiting for you in Siauliai. True, you will not be back there tonight, but you will be tomorrow. And this will be because the attractive element of the new party program about cutting off ties with the CPSU has been so far the expression of the general patriotism and independence in general."

M. Stakvilevicius replies: "You see one can never avoid aggressively disposed people." "I want to stress once again that we, as party workers, must be not totally independent but absolutely self-dependent. And this, however, does not mean that we break off all relations with the CPSU. What is more, reciprocally, we must influence the entire CPSU, because here in Lithuania much will depend on how the restructuring goes on in the CPSU."

Following this Rupeika raises another point saying that somebody said that now, when the Lithuanian Komsomol has won its independence, they do not know what to do with it.

K. Zaleckas, as ex-Komsomol leader tries to argue that the Komsomol organization in Lithuania has difficulties, but they know what to do with their independence. He says that the ranks of the organization will grow smaller.

Here Rupeika asks if something similar is not expected to take place in the Lithuanian Communist Party: First it will split according to the nationality principle, and then the ranks will begin to diminish.

K. Zaleckas replies: "Yes, of course. This is a particularly pressing issue at the Vilnius city party organization."

Zaleckas continues: "I would not want to agree with those comrades who maintain that nationality content should not be assessed in the party structure. This should be taken into consideration because practical experience indicates that people of different nationalities have different opinions on the same issues."

Following this Rimantas Purtulis says: "When I finished reading both the variants of the program I could not see that there was an alternative." He expresses the idea that alternatives should not be sought for, the existing differences should not be increased but instead a search for the common goal should take place.

K. Zaleckas states: "You see, all those who spoke at the plenum today said that we all have to sit down at the common table." Rupeika remarks: "But I do not see this, another table, there is only Karalius and..."

K. Zaleckas interrupts: "Oh, yes there, is, there is." "The majority of them are present at the plenum. And I do not think that they are against sitting down to joint discussion. And I do believe this is what is going to happen."

Rupeika asks: "And what about those who are almos another Lithuanian Communist Party, the part which split away, namely people of other nationalities? Even if we dissociate ourselves from the nationality principle in politics it will not cease to exist. You understand this very well, don't you?"

Following this K. Zaleckas speaks about the great amount of work which has to be still carried out. Minute and detailed discussion followed as to how this should be carried out.

Addressing R. Songaila, Rupeika quotes his words from the speech he made at the plenum: "Now the party has been keeping aloof from the economic activities, however, the party should not turn completely away from the phenomenon which we call an economic crisis."

Songaila says: "That is right, and I stick to this position. I even invited the participants of the plenum to hold a discussion on this issue. "The republican party organization should do something about it; we are heading toward a complete crisis. First we spoke about the washing poweder, the soap and now we already speaking about flour and so on.

"I am of the opinion that the dictate which was formerly in practice in political and economic life should not be returned to."

He then says that collective decisions should be made today on various issues.

The discussion continues on economic issues, the importance of the party's economic policy, and the conditions needed to achieve the envisaged objective, which is economic independence.

Rupeika states: "In conclusion, one last question: How will the plenum end? What decisions will the plenum adopt?"

M. Stakvilevickus says: "I think that nevertheless the decision to convene a conference and to renovate radically the composition of the Central Committee and the bureau will be adopted. The main articles concerning the independence of the party in the statute which will make the party independent in practical terms will be adopted."

R. Purtulis says: "Perhaps this will run counter to the opinion of the majority, but I do not think that this plenum is of extraordinary importance. The decision is almost clear. Whether it will be a conference or a congress, we shall discuss only the time and agenda. In fact opinions have been voiced by everybody. In December the Communist Party members will elect their representatives and then the Central Committee will be renewed, the program documents will be discussed. It is yet another question if these documents will be adopted, but the fact is that we are going to discuss the most serious party documents."

The other participants in the discussion agreed with Purtulis, adding that everybody at the plenum was

concerned about whether a split on the nationality principle should occur in the Lithuanian Communist Party.

Vilnius Art Gallery, Court Declare Strikes

PM1210142589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 89 p 2

[Report by own correspondent V. Zarovskiy: "Are Strikes Fashionable? Yesterday the USSR Supreme Soviet Session Continued Discussing the Law on Strikes. Meanwhile..."]

[Text] Vilnius—There were no exhibitions at the Vilnius Palace of Artistic Exhibitions during the first few days of October. Banners reading "Strike" hung in the windows. On the floor in the foyer you could see children's drawings—funny faces, grayish blue forests, and beautiful seas. They were the reason for the cultural workers' unusual action.

The strike committee had put an announcement in the city newspaper prior to closure: "There are many first-rate artists in Lithuania, but we have nowhere to show their work. There are also many talented children, but we are unable to provide them with the conditions necessary to develop their talent. We have repeatedly asked the Vilnius City Executive Committee [gorispolkom] to let the Palace of Artistic Exhibitions have the premises of a store that sells household items on Vokechi Street. The store could perfectly well be relocated a bit further away. We have received no response at all."

This correspondence was blown up and hung in front of the entrance. It in no whit differs from hundreds of other bureaucratic exchanges where a question is answered either by silence or at best by your promising suggestion "has been discussed."

"The household goods store is next door," Arunas Kinas, director of artistic exhibitions, said. "When scarce goods are on offer you get cars parking and enormous lines forming. The modernization of the neighboring building, part of which is occupied by the store, is now nearing completion. Builders are working on the courtyard and vans delivering exhibits are unable to drive up to the Palace of Artistic Exhibitions lifts. Our request is supported by the city party committee, the republic Ministry of Culture, and the Vilnius Gorispolkom administration for the regeneration of the old city. But, as you can see, everything hinges on bureaucrats. Our hope of creating a center for children's aesthetic education in the premises of the store is being dashed, and in Vilnius, sadly, no place is allocated for childrens' creativity."

The Palace of Artistic Exhibitions is now open to visitors. But the strikers are in a mood to fight to the end. If the city authorities do not meet them halfway, the inhabitants of Vilnius could soon witness a general "museum exhibition strike." Museums are not be trifled with...

With a child's directness Vilnius City's Leninskiy Rayon People's Court recently declared a... strike. It took umbrage at the soviet and party authorities, which ignore court officials' working conditions. Cases are heard in cramped rooms. Street noise distracts those taking part in trials. The walls of the corridor are covered in graffiti and the floor is dirty with cigarette ends scattered around. The secretaries and court officials receive paltry wages—it is impossible to enforce strict accountability. At the same time the Leninskiy Rayon People's Court contributes around R700,000 per annum to the state, as the republic youth paper has reported. The strikers are demanding that some vacant building be allocated to them as offices.

What can one say here... The judges' concern about working conditions is understandable. I have seen a large number of unsuitable court buildings, and not just in Lithuania, which excite pity and a sense of unease. But no sense of awe before Themis. And that young woman is the last person to come to mind here, in my view. A strike in a court casts doubt not only on the idea of a law-governed state but also the possibility of the exercise of judicial power.

Latvian Popular Front Official Interviewed

LD1310094989 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Excerpts] During the past weekend we were following with great interest the congress of the Latvian Popular Front. [passage omitted] Our permanent correspondent in Riga, Martins Gravitis, talked to Vice Chairman of the Latvian Popular Front Ivars Guodmanis, a 38 year-old physicist.

[Gravitis] If we are talking about the present congress and the program Latvian Popular Front now has accepted, perhaps you could comment a little bit on, as I see, a drastic change of policy. The first program announced: Latvian Popular Front is going to work for more sovereignty for Latvia, which is still a part of the federation; today we have Latvian Popular Front which has set as its aim a restoring of Latvian independent state.

[Guodmanis] I think so, it's logical way because at first this is our strategic aim, it's not aim for tomorrow or for 1 year or 2 years. We are also pragmatists. But we have to (?say truth to) our people, hope of our people. Latvia, to have their own state. [Words indistinct] result of the process of perestroyka of all Soviet Union. We all must find a new system, (?new system and process of decentralization).

[Gravitis] We know that about 50 percent of Latvia's population are non-Latvian. How are you going to make this aim natural for them? Are they going to embrace it as their own?

[Guodmanis] We think that the only way is that also the non-Latvians who are living here not only look at our movement, but take part in it.

[Gravitis] Have you thought about possible reactions in Moscow, for example, to your program, because you are still a part of the federation?

[Guodmanis] You are right, all we said was it's our stategic aim. At first we must work hard to have economic sovereignty, second is relations with (?military) forces and repressive organs, to control relations with the army here. This is parliamentary way, we are going this way, it's possible for us to solve these problems, totally without violence, totally. We are sure that we will go this way, our organization, 100 percent, while we have such traditions of democracy they will really help us to stay on this way and not to go away from this direction.

Liepaja Delegate Addresses Latvian People's Front

LD1310101889

Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0800 GMT on 8 October broadcasts a live relay of the second day of the Second Congress of the People's Front of Latvia.

One delegate, who identifies himself as speaking on behalf of the People's Front Conference from the city of Liepaja, criticizes the manner in which the People's Front platform employs the phrases "Latvian people" and "people of Latvia." He notes that the platform mentions the "Latvian people" only once, the "Latvian nation" once, and the "indigenous nation" four times, for a total of six mentions. On the other hand, the phrase "people of Latvia" is used twice, "inhabitants of Latvia" seven times, the "entire society of Latvia" once, and "citizens of Latvia" twice, for a total of 12 instances. "Six to 12. So, then, the people of Latvia are twice as close to the hearts of the platform's authors as are the Latvian people."

The speaker continues: "We know what the 'Latvian people' refers to, but what does 'people of Latvia' mean? 'People of Latvia' refers to that part of the Soviet people which resides within the administrative boundaries of Latvia.

"As one may read in RIGAS BALSS, everything is fine with the people of Latvia. They increased by 306,000 persons over the past 17 years, whereas the Latvians living in the territory of Latvia diminished by 2,900 over the same period." The question therefore arises: Who should be at the People's Front's center of attention—the people of Latvia, or the Latvian people?

According to the speaker, the city of Liepaja People's Front conference has adopted the position that the basic task and goal of the People's Front of Latvia had to be the salvation of the Latvian nation. He says that the Liepaja conference appealed for following words to be written into Article One of the platform's first section: "The Latvian People's Front is an association that fights for an independent and democratic republic of Latvia in order to insure the survival, existence, and development of the Latvian nation, and for all inhabitants to have living conditions worthy of human beings." This resolution, which would supplement the first article with the words "the survival, existence, and development of the Latvian nation," was submitted to the editorial commission, but was not taken into account. Therefore, the speaker says he is applying to the congress for this question to be decided by a vote. The speaker's words are greeted with applause.

The Liepaja delegate goes on to point out that his conference felt that a special section on "urgent tasks for the salvation of the Latvian nation" should be drawn up and included in the platform. The principle aims of this section should be: First, a reorganization of the economy, "corresponding to the vital interests of the Latvian nation—for example, reconstruction of the minibus factory in Jelgava had to be started, not by an examination by an expert economic and ecological commission, but by the question: What will this reconstruction give the Latvian people? —second, a favorable social policy for the nation; third, the restoration of a Latvian-like cultural environment in Latvia; and fourth, the establishment of a save-the-nation fund. Here, he reminds his audience of the 1939 vital-force-of-the-people law passed by the Ulmanis government which aimed at improving the material circumstances of large Latvian families.

The speaker continues: "It would be pleasant to the highest degree if by that unknown time when a free and independent Latvian is achieved, there also will be some Latvian preserved." Here, again, the Liepaja delegate's words are greeted with applause. Looking into the draft platform, he continues, "it appears that in order to make people to follow the People's Front, they are being promised an independent Latvia. However, so as not to alarm those in authority, its achievement has been postponed to some unforeseeable, distant future." The delegate goes on to say that "the march along the road to independence will be more secure if a solid corps of generals were to be installed "at the republican Supreme Soviet. It also is important, he says, not to allow too many rural people to get into the republic Supreme Soviet. More applause greets these words.

The speaker continues by saying that the Liepaja conference proposed adding the words "outside the USSR state system" to Article 2 of the People's Front platform's first section, making it read: "The Latvian People's Front proposes the aim of restoring Latvia's independence outside the USSR state system."

Nationalities Plenum, Party in Perestroyka Viewed

90US0065A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 4 Oct 89 p 1

[Article by Yuriy Kurbatov: "In Light of Reality"]

[Text] No one will dispute that this plenum of the CPSU Central Committee has been awaited in the country like none other in recent years. Relations between nationalities, a purely theoretical subject until just recently, has moved to the forefront of our vital interests, leaving everything else in the background. The tragic events in Sumgait, Fergana, Tbilisi, the strikes in Moldavia, Estonia, and other regions of the country have rocked our ship of state and the question has arisen of the integrity of our federation—let us not turn a blind eye to it.

All of this has caused—if not shock, then a certain confusion in our society. How can this be?—the voices are saying. All our lives we have been living next to one another and there has never been a problem. But, as it turns out, there have been problems. Attempts were made not to notice them, to write them off as growth-associated expenses. Glasnost and democratization have stirred up national self-consciousness and opened painful wounds. In a number of instances emotions have gained the upper hand, hasty and ill thought-out decisions have been made in the defense of wounded national sovereignty. And it is just one step from here, as we know, to inflaming nationalist passions and trampling directly on the rights and freedoms of other nations and peoples. What we have seen in the Baltic republics, I think, provides clear confirmation of this. It is no accident that certain social organizations and movements have adamantly opposed the CPSU Central Committee declaration on the state of affairs in these republics. Perhaps some of its conclusions sound harsh—but you cannot escape the truth.

All these problems did not just arise today. We might have gotten a premonition of them from the speeches given by many of the people's deputies both at the congress and at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. There in the heat of polemics, in the fiery encounters over procedural matters, it is as if the deputies overlooked this tendency, although we recall that the Congress found itself quite a number of times in a situation we would have to call critical. At such times we consoled ourselves, as if to say—we are learning, learning democracy and the parliamentary system. But if we wish to move forward even just a little bit, we must take the examination that covers the entire course.

The CPSU draft platform on the national question has become its own kind of exam question. Discussion has shown that attitudes towards it also turn out to be varied. But, in any case, this document has become the basis for seeking the only true way of escaping the situation. It was impossible to err here—these fervors are mindful of a boiling cauldron whose walls are already unable to contain the internal pressure.

I believe those who expected a prepared recipe from the Central Committee plenum to cover all practical situations will be disappointed. The party platform on national issues approved by the plenum has determined a strategic direction for the work which must be done. Now it is up to the initiative, determination, and competence of party committees. The events of recent months have shown—and this was confirmed by the plenum—that many of these committees are today still in a state of confusion, or under the influence of extremist and nationalistically oriented forces, and they are placing their trust in central power and authority. It will be necessary for them to give up this convenient position of casual observer and assume the responsibility themselves.

Interethnic, economic, and social problems have become interwoven into a tight knot. Numerous decisions and resolutions have failed to add any meat, sausage, or prime-necessity items to the store shelves. If we do not do something right away, our budget deficit will jump to R140 billion. Two other figures are worth mentioning—the state debt to the people has reached R312 billion, and to other countries—R34 billion. And here we see a paradox. Over 9,000 of our enterprises are operating at a loss—economic losses from their "operations" total about R5 billion.

The summer and fall strikes in various parts of the country have inflicted painful damage on our already shattered economy and show the insolvency of many of our programs, concepts, and political arrangements based on the priorities of command-administrative management methods.

And it is no accident that the draft plan of economic and social development of the country for 1990, currently under discussion at the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is considering extraordinary measures for revitalizing the economy and strengthening its social orientation.

We must state directly that these intense conditions demand the mobilization of all party forces. However, democratization of intra-party life and the renovation of work forms and methods are clearly lagging behind the rapid rate of politicization in society and the development of democratic principles. Essentially, the question can be put point-blank: Is the party capable of conducting and leading the perestroyka effort in the future? Will it find within itself the strength to withstand "meeting anarchy," anti-democratic demagoguery, direct attacks from left and right? Demands resound calling for the convocation of a special party congress.

The decision of the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee to convoke the next—the 28th party congress—a half year earlier than scheduled realistically reflects the situation which has evolved in the country and in the party.

Indeed, what was considered unshakable yesterday, what seemed would stand for ages, is today impeding our forward movement. Critical analysis of the CPSU program and statutes, for example, show that these fundamental party documents already lag behind the demands of our day. The statutes, for example, have failed to consolidate a single idea proposed by the April (1985)

CPSU Central Committee Plenum. All the "new" items incorporated into them were drawn up during the time of Brezhnev and Chernenko.

And we recall something else: Formulation of the guiding principle for the party's organizational structure—democratic centralism—which, with just one addition occurs in the statutes to this very day, was accomplished personally by Stalin more than half a century ago. Many of the resolutions and instructions according to which our party organizations live and operate today are decades old. Should we be surprised then, to see our party organizations clearly lagging behind in the perestroyka effort, to see revolutionary transformations within the party itself proceeding at an exceedingly slow pace?

These problems appeared at the Central Committee plenum with all their sharpness. Specifically, the idea was clearly expressed that we would not succeed if we restricted ourselves to partial changes in the existing program. As far as the statutes are concerned, it is necessary to legalize the measures already outlined by the 19th All-Union Party Conference with respect to effecting an all-encompassing democratization of the party and consolidating much of what has now been introduced into the life of party organizations. It was noted at the plenum that significant innovations will also be required with regard to party composition, the rights and obligations of communists, the status of various party structures, the principle of interaction among them and their interaction with state and public organizations, and expanding the rights of the communist parties of the union republics.

In essence, we are talking—perhaps for the first time since V.I. Lenin—about radical changes not only in the structure and functions of the party, but in its political renovation on a broad scale. We all feel that, under today's conditions, there is no other way out. Only a renovated party, thoroughly democratic in its essence, will be capable of ensuring success for perestroyka.

We are placing great hope in the pre-congress report and election campaign. This will first of all enable us to answer the question, as was noted at the plenum, of who is who in today's party leadership—at all levels, right up to Central Committee. Secondly, it will allow us the opportunity to thoroughly analyze the level of party work in organizations from top to bottom.

All of this will take place in an atmosphere of intense political activity. The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, elections in republic-level and local organs of people's power, elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress—just this far-from-complete listing of events awaiting us in the very near future gives us an idea as to the magnitude of intensity which will be totally defining our lives for the pre-congress year.

Many people are presently asking themselves the question—where do we go from here? How are we to fight the deficit, inflation, the outburst of crime, and nationalist fervor? There is a wide variety of proposed solutions, including repudiation of the socialist path of development.

I think our various kinds of "advisers" received a clear and concise answer in M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the recent Central Committee plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party: We cannot permit a return to the past; nor can we tolerate manifestations of extremism, the artificial "rocking" of our ship of state. Our party has been and remains a major organizational and coordinating force, capable of leading the people along the path of complete socialist renewal. Without the party, perestroyka will not succeed. This is the reality of life which must be taken into account. And something else is equally evident—the current stage of development of our society demands maximum intensity of effort on the part of the entire party, of every organization in it. Today we cannot just sit on the sidelines and wait.

Ban on Ukrainian Nationalists Urged

PM1210133189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent V. Drozd: "Where Are They Heading? Details Building Up a Portrait of Lvov's Informals"]

[Text] Lvov—This summer Lvov's informals marked a kind of jubilee: the anniversary of the start of mass rallies. However, they were clearly being unduly modest: They could also have claimed the "credit" for street processions with lighted candles and the picketing of the buildings of party, soviet, and law enforcement organs and the editorial offices of newspapers "audacious" enough to tell the truth about the extremist informals' aims. As well as for the fact that, when Lvov became "too small" for them, they invaded Ivano-Frankovsk, Volyn, Rovno, and Ternopol Oblasts with varying degrees of success, but the same aim ("We have come to awaken you!"). It really did smack of an invasion: columns obeying orders, yellow and blue banners, tridents...

Every time the local authorities tried to channel the passions of the rallies and streets in the direction customary in all civilized countries, concerted shouts of "Shame" alternated with heart-rending speeches about the suppression of democracy and about diktat and with excoriation of party and soviet organs, the militia, and the KGB...

Of course, the by no means simple history of both long-gone and very recent times has taken its toll on the lives and mentality of the inhabitants of this region. There are few places in our country where many people can remember a different system and a different ideology. The crushing repressions of the prewar and postwar years (primarily against the Communist Party of the West Ukraine—the CPWU) which clouded the joy of the reunification of the west Ukrainian lands with the

Ukraine within the USSR and the accelerated collectivization, with all its drawbacks, and the omnipotence of departments, which both distorted the region's socioeconomic development, have left dramatic scars on people's hearts. It must also be borne in mind that Banderovites who had once been punished often subsequently found themselves in a better position than those who had actively helped establish Soviet power.

All that did indeed happen. But were the west Ukrainian lands the only ones to suffer this fate? Trouble, in one form or another, befell our common multilingual home and spared few people.

However, local residents are told with importunate insistence: They have received particularly unfavorable treatment, they have a harder time than others. The role of the intelligentsia, which has a good grasp of the historical circumstances and is called upon to convey the truth to the masses, is exceptionally great in this situation. Its best representatives, well aware of their mission, have always risen above national egoism and personal vanity. However, there's no getting away from the facts. Certain scientists, literary figures, and artists in the west Ukraine make no secret of their nostalgia for former times, for bourgeois democracy, and blame the party and Soviet power for all misfortunes....

I have often pondered how events in the region would have developed if party committees and the mass news media had sorted the wheat from the chaff in time and had openly and unequivocally declared what was good about the intentions and actions of radically minded leaders and what was bad about them.

However, this was mentioned with sorrow and anxiety only a few days ago at a Lvov party oblast committee [obkom] plenum. As was the fact that, getting carried away with drawing up programs (which, had they been followed up with real action, might have changed the situation in the oblast for the better) and with countless numbers of sessions, the bureau and Obkom First Secretary Ya. Pogrebnyak displayed inconsistency and irresolution in relations with the informals, often shifting responsibility for their actions onto law enforcement organs. And as was the fact that what was missing was exactingness, as opposed to exhortations, toward those Communists and obkom members who have a rather peculiar concept of their duty in such a complex situation. So much time has been wasted on pinning hopes on instructions "from above," so many mistakes have been made! But the "marshals" of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), the "Ukrainian Catholic Church Defense Committee," and some of the members of "Memorial," the Ukrainian Language Society, the "Lion Society," and certain others have not abandoned their aims but are acting still more vigorously.

In this sphere, according to the logic of the "fishers of men," anything goes: juggling with historical facts, bombarding the past and present that oversteps the bounds of decency, and a brush dripping with tar for use in painting pictures of party and soviet officials.

Who benefits from this? It has to be said right away, without beating around the bush: The "marshals" knew what they were doing right from the very beginning and were merely biding their time before revealing their aims and their strength. True, at first there were still slogans praising perestroyka (although even then there were no specific proposals as to how the socioeconomic situation in the city and the oblast could be improved or the spheres in which the informals were prepared to offer assistance), but soon the "directors" clearly decided that the decor was sufficient evidence of their commitment to the ideas of renewal and decided to do without the artistic flimflam: Let the audience become attuned to the director's intention in advance and be permeated by his idea. They calculated that since the party had revealed with pain and sorrow the truth about our history and about itself, the most suitable moment had arrived for tearing it away from the people and then morally destroying it.

How is this happening in Lvov? Whatever the topic to which rallies are ostensibly devoted—setting up a Ukrainian Language Society named for T.G. Shevchenko or meeting with delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference, the elections of people's deputies or ecology (not that it is possible to list everything when rallies have already taken up a total of a month of the year's calendar)—the task of the directors always boils down to the same thing: not prompting people to reflect and find out the truth, but without fail causing a small (or even better a loud) scandal and reducing the audience to ecstasy.

I well remember one of the first rallies on the creation of the Ukrainian Language Society. There were no real grounds for a fuss: The founders did not like the building allocated for the conference. The city authorities did not exactly act in the best possible way in this situation. But the informals did not even contemplate seeking even a bad peace [allusion to proverb: "A bad peace is better than a good quarrel"]. The scandal played into their hands. They looked for snags. They had long been waiting for a opportunity to proclaim the birth of a new political force. And now the opportunity had arrived. They are still using the same ploy, polishing their technique for excommunicating awkward customers and relieving at the microphone those of "their people" who become hated figures or who blurt out strategic plans ahead of the appointed time...

However, let us return to one of the first rallies in the city. The residents of Lvov, who at that time were meeting spontaneously, heard torrent upon torrent of hysterical words. Well aware that in the western region of the republic you cannot seriously speak of any trampling of the Ukrainian language, the organizers of the rally waxed eloquent about its fate in the eastern oblasts of the Ukraine.

Calculated hypocrisy. For when yellow and blue banners and tridents began to appear in Lvov, those who were holding them were quite untroubled by the associations that these symbols of the Petlyura regime would evoke among residents of the eastern oblasts of the Ukraine. When the lovers of national symbols were reminded of this, they responded with the argument that repressions were also committed beneath the red banner. Thus they unhesitatingly put the state flag of our motherland on the same level as the banner which sanctified the bloodiest orgies against that very same red banner.

It is noteworthy that the more freely it is possible to breathe and the more democratism, glasnost, and openness become part of our life, the more the various movements, societies, and unions marching in closely serried ranks to attack perestroyka multiply in number.

It has to be admitted that they have gathered strength partly because for too long we have continued to write off glaringly obvious means of achieving the goal as poor standards of debate, intolerance, and the inability to find a common language.

"Party workers are now under fire from all sides," A. Kritskiy, first secretary of Chortkovskiy party rayon committee in Ternopol Oblast, told me. "I think the adoption of a Law on Informal Associations will put many things in their proper place. It must stipulate with the utmost clarity which of them can operate within the system of a law-based socialist state and which 'friends of the people' we must part company with. And on what basis are we supposed to conduct a dialogue? Are we supposed to accept the demand that the party quit political life, that the USSR be partitioned, that capitalism be restored, and that the Ukraine be dismembered? And what is the result of agreement, assuming that agreement is possible on such a platform? The extremist leaders reject any other platform."

The activity of a youth camp was stopped this summer near Lvov. Its regime and the organization and thrust of the instruction made it clear against whom the "tutors" intended to send their "fighters." What was noteworthy? The camp contained none of the portraits of T.G. Shevchenko and I. Franko which the informals invariably use to adorn their actions. What is the point of window dressing among "your own people"?

And is the silence of the informal leaders along with certain Lvov people's deputies about the misfortunes that the Banderovites brought to the inhabitants of west Ukrainian lands merely accidental?

Of course, the leaders, like the membership of the informal organizations, are heterogeneous. The reality is that both those who sincerely want to help the party in perestroyka and those who will not accept Soviet power, cannot forgive it for old grievances, and are not averse to fueling interest in themselves in order to slake their personal vanity, find themselves under the same "roof." It is for them to decide how they ended up in the same ranks and how they are going to sort out who is who.

Until this demarcation has occurred, everyone marching in those ranks must be clearly aware that the leaders' ambitions reflect on all their followers. And therefore they must share the responsibility for the goals toward which the power-hungry "bosses" [vozhdi] are leading them. Namely to deprive the party of its vanguard role, to split the USSR, or, if this proves impossible, to divide the Ukraine (according to the foreign pattern) into ethnic pieces, to reject Soviet power and socialism, and to restore capitalism. And the shortest way to implement their intentions (from Lvov rallies to the constituent congress of the People's Movement of the Ukraine for Restructuring—PMU) is to seize power.

What UHU leaders V. Chernovol, the Goryn brothers, and company proclaimed at the Lvov rallies with provisos and excuses (they had been misunderstood, they said) and what the Lvov writers R. Bratun and R. Fedoriv, Leninist Communist Youth League worker Yu. Sorochik, and others fragmentarily and grudgingly said was expressed in its most concentrated form at the PMU Congress in Kiev. Voluntarily or otherwise, by not dissociating itself from extreme, radical statements and intentions the PMU not only admitted that all the informals are now gathered together beneath the same "roof" but also became the expresser of their views and intentions.

The mask has been dropped. The goals are clear. The methods have been defined. The shareout of leadership portfolios can begin among the fellow believers.

That is the truth about the words and deeds of the "saviors of the Ukraine." It would be a good thing if those who still entertain illusions that the UHU and PMU leaders are concerned about the people's fate knew that truth. The time has come to reflect: What is the aim of those who, euphoric at the yellow and blue flags and tridents, are calling for an end to the "occupation" of west Ukrainian lands and are surreptitiously preparing for them the fate of a handmaiden of foreign masters?

The closer the elections to local soviets and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet get and the more real the possibility of seizing power seems, the thicker the smokescreen generated by the sundry informal leaders becomes. History shows that such things have happened before. Just as it recalls how they have ended and the misfortunes they have brought. So I want to remind my fellow countrymen of words that were spoken in a similar situation: People, be vigilant!

One final point. The CPSU Central Committee September Plenum spoke with justification of the need to judicially prohibit and disband nationalist, chauvinist, and other extremist organizations. The practical implementation of this should not be delayed.

Minister on Meeting Miners' Demands

904F0007A Moscow TRUD in Russian 1 Oct 89 pp 1-2

[Report on interview with USSR Minister of the Coal Industry M.I. Shchadov, by A. Kozlov: "How the Ministry of the Coal Industry Is Keeping Its Word"; date and place not given]

[Text] Almost 2 months have passed since the day the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a decree on measures which are to ensure compliance with the demands of striking miners. How are these measures being implemented? The editorial office of the newspaper TRUD asked representatives of the government commissions which have participated in developing agreements with the strike (workers') committees and heads of trade union organs to discuss this. As many strike committees of the Donbass desired, the first interview is with the USSR Minister of the Coal Industry M.I. Shchadov.

[Kozlov] Mikhail Ivanovich, some representatives of strike committees who have participated in the proceedings of the recent plenum of the Central Committee of the trade union of coal industry workers stated that the demands of strikers are not being complied with, in particular, by the USSR Minugleprom [Ministry of the Coal Industry]. What can you say on this subject?

[Shchadov] We cannot agree with such categorical statements. A set of measures has been worked out on the basis of demands made by the workers which were considered by the government commissions together with the strike committees and with the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] which provides for:

—granting economic independence to enterprises, mines, and opencast mines, and a profound change in the organization of management of the coal industry;
—developing the social sphere, and primarily the construction of housing and cultural and service facilities in an accelerated manner;
—streamlining the system of economic incentives and improving the conditions of work and life of miners;
—resolutely ameliorating the ecological situation in coal-mining regions.

The implementation of these measures is guaranteed by a special resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers adopted in August 1989 in execution of which an order was issued in our ministry. Deputy ministers have been charged with monitoring the execution of the resolution and the order individually for every point. The procedure has been set for reporting to the government on a monthly basis on the course of executing the resolutions adopted.

Incidentally, after the first day of proceedings of the trade union Central Committee plenum, the summary report of the ministry was distributed to its participants who could evaluate the work done objectively and make sure that the demands of the miners are being complied with within the deadlines set, though we must admit that this is accomplished with great difficulty and with the greatest effort.

[Kozlov] Could you tell us about what has already been done?

[Shchadov] Certainly. As you know, the government has fully met the demand of miners to pay compensation of sorts associated with the extreme conditions of underground which entail potential danger and risk. Bonuses for work on the evening and night shift have been introduced effective July of this year for employees of all enterprises operating on several shifts. Since August, bonuses have been paid to the employees of the coal industry and mine construction permanently employed underground for the standard time in transit within the mine from the shaft to the work station and back. The total of such bonuses, more than 1 billion rubles a year, testifies eloquently to their scope.

The issues of retaining skilled cadres, especially in areas with unfavorable and at times severe climatic conditions, have always been very significant for the coal industry. Increasing regional coefficients for the miners of the Kuznetsk, Pechora, and Karaganda Coal Basins will facilitate solving this problem. At the same time, the ministry has submitted to the USSR Goskomtrud [State Committee for Labor and Social Problems] proposals for the further streamlining of the entire system of regional adjustment of wages.

Here is one more aspect of the same problem. At present, the consideration of the issue of preserving the tenure for northern bonuses when employees transfer from one enterprise to another, of granting northern bonuses from the first day on the job to young people living in these areas, and of providing sick pay at 100 percent of wages in case of an illness in the time between periods on duty is coming to a close.

The USSR Goskomtrud and the AUCCTU have adopted resolutions on the payment of a lump-sum tenure bonus to employees performing in-house construction and assembly work, and on other privileges.

While resolving the issues of increasing the salaries of those who work at the mines at present and looking toward the future of our industry, we cannot by any means disregard improving the standard of living of our retirees, of people who have given the best years of their life to underground work. This is why this has been reflected in the Retirement Benefits Law considering which is on the agenda of the current session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In particular, the right is envisaged for employees of mines and opencast mines to retire after a tenure of more than 25 years in underground work regardless of age, with the retirement benefit granted amounting to 70 percent of the average wage; even more preferential conditions are going to be set for the workers of main underground professions.

A draft Law on Leave has been submitted to the USSR Goskomtrud which provides for a substantial increase in the duration of annual paid leave for various categories of employees, and primarily to those who work under difficult and harmful conditions. To our mind, measures of an economic nature should be combined with moral incentives. This is why we have developed and submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government proposals for improving the system of incentives to miners for long and impeccable labor.

Another set of issues associated with compliance with the demands of miners affects a profound change in organizing the management of the coal industry. From among them, I would stress granting economic independence to mines and opencast mines. Even now such independence has been granted to 164 enterprises in keeping with the decisions of labor collectives. This work is going on. However, we may understand the many collectives which prefer not to be hasty in this manner and are carefully weighing their potential.

Unlike the practices previously in effect, the collectives have been given the right to set output quotas, rates, and service quotas themselves within the framework of expanding the independence of labor collectives, as well as to decide how many engineers and technicians need to be retained on the staff at the expense of funds generated by the enterprise. The collectives now have the right to make additional social payments from the moneys of the financial incentives fund in conjunction with occupational diseases, the introduction of additional leave, aid to families with many children, and the payment for the maintenance of children in pre-school facilities.

As far as reductions in the managerial apparatus are concerned, its manpower in production associations will be reduced by almost one-third, and at enterprises by one-fifth. Main territorial administrations in Donetsk, Voroshilovgrad, and Kemerovo Oblasts will be abolished.

The central apparatus of the ministry has noticeably "lost weight," and it will lose still more. Under the conditions of increasing the independence of enterprises which, on top of that, create voluntarily various kinds of associations or other kinds of management using various forms of property—state, cooperative, leasing, joint-stock, and other—the style and methods of work of the ministry itself change profoundly; it has been "archiving" the command-administrative approach to managing the industry. If nothing else, the following fact testifies to this. Over last year and this year, 90 labor-intensive forms of statistical reporting on production and research and technical operations and capital construction have been canceled.

We should refer specifically to the issues associated with coal prices because the economic and financial condition of enterprises depends to a great degree on resolving them correctly. Strike committees have made the demand that book prices for coal be revised because old prices cannot cover additional expenses. Revising the book prices throughout the entire industry is a very labor-intensive endeavor. This is why it was resolved to finance measures aimed at putting remunerations in order until the end of the third quarter from the state budget and to change prices in the fourth quarter so as not to hold up the payment of wages. This work is coming to an end. New book prices for coal are being introduced effective 1 October.

Unfortunately, there is no opportunity to enumerate in our interview everything that has already been done. However, I may say straightforwardly that the work is proceeding in a planned manner, in keeping with the measures scheduled for every mining area.

However, we also encounter hard-to-solve problems.

[Kozlov] What do you mean?

[Shchadov] Primarily, the material and technical supply and the availability of railway cars to enterprises. A critical situation has emerged in this matter. As of now, the industry has failed to receive hundreds of thousands of cubic meters of mine props and ties compared to the planned level; there are no rolled metal products, steel pipes, and cement.

Let us take just one item—short deliveries of mine support materials. For this reason, work on repairing mine workings has been suspended at many mines, and the pace of drifting has been substantially reduced. However, the main point is that it is impossible to ensure safe conditions for the work of miners due to the absence of timber.

Producer plants of other ministries are not accepting for execution orders for the delivery of 25 universal excavating machines, 105 bulldozers, 92 metal-cutting machine tools, and some other pieces of machinery and equipment which are in short supply in our industry. For example, in the first 8 months the "Crane" Association of the USSR Mintyazmash [Ministry of Heavy Machine Building] failed to deliver 13 high-output mechanized complexes. For this reason alone, 2 million tons of coal will not be supplied in the fourth quarter of this year. Justified apprehensions arise that a similar situation may emerge next year as well because the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] are not fulfilling to the full extent the assignments of the USSR Council of Ministers for improving the supply of most important material and technical resources to the enterprises of the coal industry in 1990.

Enterprises of the industry suffer great losses due to the extremely unsatisfactory delivery of railroad cars by railroads. Suffice it to say that due to this 18.5 million tons less coal was shipped during the first 8 months of this year compared to the corresponding period of 1988. As a result, as many as 35 million tons of coal have already accumulated in the stockpiles of coal enterprises.

A particularly alarming situation has emerged in the Kuznetsk Basin. In August and September alone, the miners failed to receive 43,500 cars. At 11 enterprises, caked coal is burning. At many mines and opencast mines, the acceptance of current output is restricted, the warehouses are overflowing. The enterprises of the basin are suffering irrecoverable losses. Seasonal grades of coal (middlings, slurry) are not being shipped which hampers preparations for work under winter conditions.

The situation with the accumulation of coal at thermal power stations, coke-chemistry plants, and in the household consumer sector, especially in rural areas, cannot but alarm us.

[Kozlov] In September, the industry was in arrears on coal deliveries to the state to the tune of more than 4 million tons. Are the railroad employees the only culprits in this, or are there other reasons as well?

[Shchadov] You are right. It would be unfair to shift all the blame for the unsatisfactory work of our industry to our contractors alone. We have many difficulties and unsolved problems of our own.

At the meetings of government commissions with labor collectives, assurances were given that the coal industry workers will make up the time lost as a result of the strike. It was expected that meeting the demands made will be an incentive for that. Unfortunately, the situation with the mining of coal, especially coking coal, remains extremely difficult.

Recently, production and technological discipline in the industry has deteriorated considerably, and the load on stopes has fallen. The switch in a number of mines to the work schedule with one general day off in some cases is not accompanied by tapping additional reserves and improving labor organization. In September alone, 1.3 million tons of coal were lost due to switching to the interrupted work week without preparation.

Most of the production associations are now failing to meet the plan. In the Donetsk Basin, the output of coal fell short in September by more than 1 million tons; consequently, not only the entire reserve of above-the-plan output was lost but arrears of 476,000 tons from the beginning of the year were also allowed to occur. Other basins did not pick up the pace required either. The Association "Karagandaugol" is working considerably worse than last year; the output of coal has declined at the mines of the Kuzbass and the Pechora Basin.

The situation is exacerbated by the fact that the strike committees are relieving many managers and chief specialists of their responsibilities by reason of lack of confidence. Some of them indeed deserve such a fate. However, a vote of no confidence is frequently given without sufficient grounds, in an emotional upsurge. For example, at the Churubay-Nurinskaya Mine of the "Karagandaugol" Association the decision was made to elect a new director of the mine. They announced the vacancy, called a conference, and as a result elected... the same director as their manager.

Reshuffling the cadres is not good for business. It disrupts production, sows discord between the engineers and technicians and the workers, and that is all. They have already understood this in labor collectives. At present, mutual understanding and the environment of constructive dialogue are being established which brings about the stabilization of the work of enterprises.

[Kozlov] What can you say about resolving social issues raised by the strikers?

[Shchadov] The transformations under way in the country, revolutionary in essence, the development of democracy and glasnost have revealed the lag in the social sphere, including in the coal industry, in a particularly graphic manner. Despite the miners having held a stable leading position among the employees of industrial branches in terms of wages for many years, despite consistent increases in the volume of capital investment in building housing, day-care centers, hospitals, polyclinics, and other social facilities, the residual principle of allocating funds for the development of the social sphere which existed in the country and in the coal industry did not make it possible to fully meet the increasing needs of miners and their families.

The failure to solve social problems in the coal industry and the difficulties experienced in furnishing the foodstuffs and consumer goods to the populace were one of the reasons for the strikes, despite much having been done in the coal industry recently in order to resolve these issues. Many cities and localities have been built and received amenities due to the resources of the industry. Investment for such purposes has been increasing year after year. Capital investment in developing the social sphere increased by a factor of 2 compared to the last 5-year plan in Kuznetsk and Karaganda Basins, and in the Donetsk and Pechora Basins by a factor of 1.5. Still, they are not sufficient in order to fully meet the needs of coal industry employees, particularly for housing.

In the 4 years of the current 5-year plan, 9,912,000 square meters of housing will be commissioned for the employees of the industry, as well as pre-school establishments for 47,900 children and schools for 43,600 children, and polyclinics for 11,100 visits, which exceeds 5-year plan assignments. As you can see, these volumes are quite high; however, they are too small in order to make up for the lost decades.

For 1990, we have set the task of commissioning as many as 2,900,000 square meters of housing. This is 376,000 square meters more than the 5-year assignment calls for. We plan not only to maintain but to considerably increase the pace of commissioning housing in the 13th 5-year plan. According to preliminary data, the volume of housing construction in the next 5-year plan will come

up to 17 million square meters which will amount to an increase of 40 percent compared to the current 5-year plan.

We are facing even greater tasks in the period until the year 2000. Taking into account the increasing need for housing, it is planned to commission 55 million square meters of housing between 1986 and 2000 which is twice as much as in the previous 15 years. In the period until the year 2000, it is planned to commission pre-school facilities for 175,000 children, general schools for 206,000 students, hospitals with 20,000 beds, and polyclinics for 45,000 visits per shift, clubs and houses of culture with 83,000 seats. The ministry is planning to increase the capacity of its own housing construction facilities, especially those producing bricks, expanded-clay gravel, non-ore materials, and carpentry products in order to support the planned programs of social development of the industry.

This will definitely boost the potential of our construction crews but only on the condition that effective use will be made of it. Look what is actually happening. Judge for yourselves: The ministry has shifted 250 million rubles this year to the facilities of the social sphere from production-oriented construction giving complete independence to enterprises in compiling the plan. In the field, they did not take measures in order to utilize the funds allocated. As a result, 129 million rubles of capital investment were not utilized in 8 months.

Improving the provision of foodstuffs and manufactured consumer goods to the employees is a particularly important issue for the ministry. We are proceeding along two avenues in this field. We are developing our own agricultural enterprises vigorously. We have 938 auxiliary farms, including 58 large sovkhozes [state farms]. This year alone, they have produced more than 16 kilograms of meat, 36 kilograms of milk, and 31 kilograms of vegetables per one employee. In the next 5-year plan, we envisage doubling these amounts.

In July through September, meat products, sugar, synthetic detergents and soap, footwear and other goods for supplying mining areas were allocated from state reserves. On the whole, as far as the social sphere is concerned, we must say bluntly that there is a considerable number of very difficult questions which will not be resolved without government aid.

[Kozlov] One more question. Judging by appeals to the newspaper TRUD, many employees of the industry simply are not aware of how resolving the issues raised by the strikers is advancing, that is, information on the actions of the government and the ministry is not reaching miners' collectives. To your mind, what needs to be done in order to inform the coal miners better?

[Shchadov] I would like to stress this once again: The minister and the collegium understand that joint resolutions adopted by the government commissions and strike committees should be carried out to the letter. There cannot be any doubt as to this. At the last meeting of the collegium, the decision was made to forward information on the course of meeting the demands to the associations on a monthly basis and to bring it to the attention of the labor collectives.

[Kozlov] The last question. Does the Minugleprom have proposals or a program for "preempting" strikes by employees in the future?

[Shchadov] An unambiguous conclusion has been drawn from the July events: We should change the methods of operation of the ministry and local management organs of the coal industry rapidly and in a most resolute manner. We should improve the conditions of work and life of miners in every possible way. Much is already being done to this end to which I have referred above. However, is it enough? I will put it bluntly: It is not. This is why the ministry is now betting on independence, self-management, and self-financing of labor collectives in order to solve the problems accumulated in the industry and implement the principles of the economic reform more completely. Rallied by the common purpose, the miners will actually become genuine masters of production. Naturally, all of this will help in improving the conditions of their life and work, ensuring the stable operation of the industry with a view to furnishing fuel to the national economy. Once the miners become genuine masters, they will not go on strikes.

KGB's Kryuchkov L'UNITA Interview Cited

90UN0063A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Aug 89 pp 1, 2

[Abridged reprint of interview with KGB Chief Vladimir Aleksandrovich Kryuchkov by D. Kyeza, L'UNITA correspondent: "In the Same Trench With Gorbachev"]

[Text] Vladimir Aleksandrovich Kryuchkov is 65 years old. He was a worker and then a court investigator, procurator, and diplomat. In 1956 he was in Hungary with Yuriy Andropov in all the sequential stages of his career. In 1959 Kryuchkov returned to Moscow and became a worker of the Central Committee apparatus and one of the assistant secretaries of the Central Committee. When Andropov became KGB chairman Vladimir Aleksandrovich also moved to Dzerzhinskiy Square. He quickly became one of Andropov's deputies. He would continue to monitor the situation even after Andropov became the party general secretary. For many years Kryuchkov worked in the most delicate sphere: intelligence. Gorbachev placed him at the head of the powerful national security committee last fall. Thus Kryuchkov took the place of Viktor Cherbikov, a member of the Politburo, and Kryuchkov is still "only" a member of the Central Committee. On the walls of his sunny office, which is on Kuznetskiy Most Street, hang two portraits: Lenin—over his desk and Gorbachev—at his side. In the center of the room is a bust of Dzerzhinskiy, the chairman of the Cheka [Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counterrevolution and Sabotage]. On the reading table framed by two comfortable arm

chairs is a strange clock with a circulating pendulum which moves around the face like a moving crown.

This is the first time a KGB chairman has granted an interview to a foreign journalist, and he himself emphasized this before the first question was asked....

This is the way a conversation between USSR KGB Chairman V.A. Kryuchkov and correspondent D. Kyeza recently published in the Italian newspaper L'UNITA begins.

Read the material from this conversation on page 2.

[L'UNITA] Thank you for the unusual favor granted to my newspaper and for your kind words. I would like to begin asking questions immediately. In the West rivers of ink have been used to write about the organization you head. This is understandable for people are curious about everything that is surrounded by secrecy. Even people's deputies have asked you many "indelicate" questions. They too, like we in the West, know very little about the KGB, although the committee plays a significant role in all events taking place in your country. What program do you have to allow glasnost to penetrate into your organization?

[Kryuchkov] ...Under modern conditions we cannot successfully perform our functions without support and understanding in the society or without control by the society. If we turn to history we see that the principles of glasnost are not new to us. They lay at the basis of the activity of the Cheka—the "extraordinary commission" created by Lenin and Feliks Dzerzhinskiy. As proof I wish to quote a curious document which has never been made public before: Order No 101 of the VChK [All-Russian Extraordinary Commission] of 7 August 1920. There, along with everything else, it is written that "it is necessary to devote attention to familiarizing those around us with the activity of the Cheka."

"The need for this is explained by the following: Many people rebuke us, many give incorrect information about our work, and very few know the essence of our work. All this has a harmful effect on our work and it occurs because almost none of the Chekas has been properly handled by the local press. In order to eliminate this shortcoming it is suggested that all Chekas regularly publicize the activity of the Cheka in local press organs and also give more regular reports to the workers."

This document is almost 70 years old but its ideas resound in our turbulent age of restructuring. We know, unfortunately, that this was a period when the principle of glasnost was forgotten. The consequences turned out to be tragic. They are being felt even today. Much of what existed in the recent past must now be changed and some things have to be eliminated. At the same time it is necessary to determine the principles which will make it possible to take the correct path. One of these, and the main one, is expansion of control on the part of the Supreme Soviet, in which the Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security has been created. You correctly mentioned a "program." We are now engaged in its implementation, meeting with people frequently, producing more and more publications, and receiving criticism directed against us differently. Incidentally, if anyone tells you that he likes to be criticized do not believe him.

[L'UNITA] By the way, how did you feel about Yuriy Vlasov's speech at the Congress of Deputies?

[Kryuchkov] I must say that it made a heavy, unpleasant impression on me. I was ready to hang my head in shame. Other ministers around me began to nod their heads understandingly. But then I said to myself: It is necessary to think about what is happening. Why is Deputy Vlasov, whose father was not so far removed from state security organs, speaking with such rage and zeal against the KGB? And—strange as it may seem—I unexpectedly came to the conclusion that in a certain way one could understand him and I even began to justify him. I recalled that he does not know much about what we are doing now or what we plan to do. And I also thought: If all Soviet people were similarly informed it is possible that many of them would think the same thing.

[L'UNITA] How do you assess KGB activity during the period you call "stagnation"?

[Kryuchkov] I must say that this was not the best period in our life. On the contrary, certain of our neglected diseases became worse and their consequences are being felt to this day. At that time we were trying people who were called "dissidents" in the West. But I wish to emphasize that at that time we were acting in accordance with legislation that existed. I agree that this was far from an ideal law but if we had not stayed within its limits the consequences would have been much more severe. In one way or another many of those who were convicted on the basis of this law have returned to normal life today and the injustice dealt to these people has been rectified.

[L'UNITA] You said at one meeting that much of what had been written about the KGB in the West is untrue. Frequently both in the USSR and abroad people think that the KGB is like an all-powerful eye which sees everything and knows everything. Nonetheless, especially in the USSR during the past few years, there have been a number of events which, it would seem, escaped the control of the committee. For example, Sumgait, Fergana, Novyy Uzen, and so forth. How was it that the local workers did not notice all that was brewing?

[Kryuchkov] To know everything is not our goal, if for no other reason than that this is impossible. ...But one cannot say that we knew nothing. No, we knew, but we did not understand adequately. Yes, in Sumgait the forces for maintaining order were caught unawares. We knew about the disturbances that were being prepared in Fergana but we did not evaluate them adequately. We also knew a good deal about what was happening in Novyy Uzen but the local organs would not take action. I do not think that state security organs can solve

problems any longer by relying exclusively on their own forces: They need the help of all citizens and labor collectives.

[L'UNITA] What is the meaning of the recent decrees of the Supreme Soviet pertaining to maintaining public order and forming "temporary committees for stepping up the fight against crime?"

[Kryuchkov] There has been a sharp increase in crime during the past 2 years. Nonetheless we have not yet reached the crime level found in Western countries. You still excel in that.

[L'UNITA] I do not deny that our mafia gives us an unenviable record...

[Kryuchkov] Incidentally, I was once asked what the difference is between the mafia and organized crime. In my opinion, the mafia is a state within a state. We have not reached that point yet but unless we take the proper measures we could reach it. There have been periods in our history when crime has increased sharply: for example, immediately after the civil war, at the end of the twenties and the beginning of the thirties, and immediately after World War II. But the scale of today's crime forces us to take extraordinary measures, if only because the people demand it. There are many reasons for this. Take, for example, the cooperatives. Along with those useful ones that produce goods and render services, there are also those that engage in intermediary activity, that which was previously called open speculation. Such cooperatives have immense amounts of money concentrated in their hands, so great that their wages reach 1,500-2,000 rubles a month and sometimes much more. This is one of the reasons. In addition to everything else, the reorganization of the economy is now in full swing. The commodity deficit is the most serious difficulty. A pathological disproportion has now developed between the mass of money and the quantity of goods offered.

Money appears as if from out of nowhere: This is a dangerous process which leads to inflation. And when profit comes very easily, crime also begins to flourish very easily along with it. I think it is necessary to take very energetic action in order to restore order and eliminate the sources of crime that are being generated. This can be achieved in two ways: through economic and financial measures and through stepping up the fight against crime.

[L'UNITA] But in fact, in the Uzbek mafia, the so-called "Gdlyan affair," there are none of the economic factors about which you spoke. The party organizations themselves became the virus of crime.

[Kryuchkov] I would not call this affair "Uzbek" because then we are blaming the Uzbeks. The first criminal case appeared as early as the end of the sixties. Then a number of others followed. The KGB participated in their investigation and took to court a number of intermediaries and also leaders at the republic level. Large sums of money were returned and sentences followed even to the highest punitive measure for theft of especially large amounts. At the beginning of the eighties the cases were turned over to the procurator's office and Gdlyan took them over a little later.

I have already spoken about this in the parliament and do not want to go into it deeply since a special commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet is now working on it.

I think it was correct to create this commission because—as Gdlyan asserts—the highest authorities were mixed up in the criminal activity. The investigation should show what really happened. We in the KGB do not have this information. There is one serious aspect to this matter. It is necessary to shed light on the legality of the activity of the procurator's investigators and attentively study the methods used for the investigation. I think the commission's conclusion will be exhaustive and objective...

[L'UNITA] Allow me to ask you a question of a personal nature. You worked with Yuriy Andropov for 30 years...

[Kryuchkov] To be exact, 29.

[L'UNITA] Do you think that if Andropov had lived longer he would have initiated the restructuring?

[Kryuchkov] I think so. He would have taken the same path. He had an excellent understanding of the situation that had developed in the country. He was a party worker, a diplomat and, finally, for 15 years he was the head of the KGB. Andropov knew the party well and his position as KGB chairman enabled him to have sufficiently broad information...

[L'UNITA] Another question of a personal nature. The KGB chairman was frequently a part of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee. Do you not think that you should hold this responsible post as well? Or does the creation of the socialist "law-governed state" also change the special status enjoyed by the Committee for State Security in the party organs?

[Kryuchkov] In the first place the KGB has not always been a part of the highest party leadership. I am a member of the Central Committee. For me this is a great honor and an immense responsibility. Deputy Sobchak raised this problem in the Supreme Soviet. You will probably not believe me but I am personally very calm about all of this. I never thought that I would be chairman of the KGB and when I heard rumors about this I thought: Maybe this wave will engulf me. But still it came to me. And it is no accident that I responded to Deputy Lauristin by saying that I considered myself a "candidate" and not a "contender." In any case it was not for me but for the Party Central Committee to decide, and I never expressed my viewpoint regarding this to anyone under any circumstances.

[L'UNITA] Many people both think and write that it is the KGB and the army that present a threat to democratization. What can you say about this?

[Kryuchkov] Your question touches upon a subject that is as old as the hills but still popular—"suspicions" of "secret conspiracies" and designs for "military coups." But I wish to answer you quite seriously. In the Western mass media recently there is frequent mention of a certain "conservatism" or even "reaction" on the part of security organs and the Soviet Army, their intolerance or even hostility toward the changes taking place in our country. There is no basis in reality for these conclusions. KGB organs and the army are closely linked to the people. They completely and fully accept the program for restructuring that was developed by the CPSU and are prepared to support and defend it. Unfortunately, the need to defend this program does exist.

[L'UNITA] I am not so naive as to expect that you will reveal all your secrets to a Western correspondent. But I should like to hear your opinion as a specialist. How do you evaluate the level of your special services—higher, lower, or the same as that of the Western special services?

[Kryuchkov] A concrete and substantiated answer to your question would require a developed analysis.

For obvious reasons I shall not go into that. Moreover, as a specialist I would refrain from concrete evaluations although I have quite definite sympathies. Over many years of work in intelligence—and I headed this administration for 14 years—I was frequently asked: Which special service is the best? They usually mentioned the KGB and two or three others. But these services cannot be compared because of the different political and professional principles of their activity and also because of their moral principles and methods of activity. Violence, inhumanity, and infringement on human rights have always been alien to the work of our special services. As concerns Soviet counterintelligence, in past years about 30 foreign agents have been discovered and caught in criminal activity. All of them were caught red-handed, as they say. It is best to ask Western special services whether this number is large or small. I hope you understand my meaning. As concerns Western special services, I can say that they are strong opponents and we must look out for them.

[L'UNITA] You came out in favor of publishing the KGB budget. Did you receive permission to do this?

[Kryuchkov] The KGB has nothing against making its "budget" public. I think that when it becomes known the community's respect for us will increase. One way or the other we need a decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[L'UNITA] So is it impossible for you to tell me the number of workers in your department? At least generally, including the border troops, secret agents, technical personnel, and so forth?

[Kryuchkov] The number of border troops (who are included in the KGB) has already been announced—200,000. And the rest of this question overlaps with the preceding one. The publication of the KGB budget will be justified if Soviet citizens know about the staff it is used to maintaining. In any case it is first necessary to determine the amount of detail to be given since as in any other state, not all figures pertaining to analogous organizations can be made public. As you see, here glasnost is restricted to the framework of professional secrecy.

[L'UNITA] What actions of Soviet citizens are included within the competence of the KGB?

[Kryuchkov] Only those which are linked to encroachment on state security and are envisioned by existing legislation.

The limits of competence when criminal actions are committed are regulated by the criminal procedure codes (article 126 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] criminal procedure code). This pertains especially to state crimes, especially dangerous ones, and certain others. If you are interested in the details I shall tell you that there are 18 kinds of crimes that fall directly within the competence of the KGB, and about 15 of them are ones in which we conduct the investigation in conjunction with the Procuracy and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. I must add that on instructions from procurator agencies in certain cases we participate in disclosing various kinds of common crimes.

[L'UNITA] ...Tell me, please, have there been terrorist acts in the USSR that were organized abroad? And, in your opinion, with the increased contacts with the outside worked as the country becomes more and more open will the danger of such acts not increase?

[Kryuchkov] In various historical stages of the development of the Soviet state there have been terrorist acts inspired from abroad. And at the present time the danger of terrorism really does exist. This is shown by cases of encroachment on the rights of Soviet citizens and Soviet representatives abroad and attempts to illegally ship arms, ammunition, explosives, and toxic chemicals into our country.

There are international terrorist organizations and there are individual criminals.

The wave of terrorism that has engulfed the world is threatening us as well. We welcome increased contacts and exchanges with other countries and expansion of economic, cultural, and other ties. But we cannot allow the "exportation" of terrorism to our home. We are taking all the necessary measures to protect the security of Soviet people. It is known that terrorism has gone beyond the framework of individual states and has become a serious international problem. It can be solved only through the combined efforts of various states, and this means that the special services cannot get along without cooperation in this case. We are prepared for this kind of cooperation in the name of people's safety.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA has also accumulated questions for the KGB Chairman. V.A. Kryuchkov has

agreed to answer them and in the near future we shall meet with him again on the pages of KOMSOMOLKA.

Union of Soviet Managers Founded; Head Appointed

LD1310155589 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—To combat bureaucracy and the administrative-command system—this is the task of Soviet businessmen in the new USSR Union of Managers.

Its constituent congress opened here today in the presence of 271 delegates from seven union republics. They include prominent scientists, heads of large industrial enterprises and associations, directors and production chiefs of joint ventures.

Addressing the opening session on behalf of the organisation committee, Professor Vladimir Groshev, rector of the Moscow National Economy Institute, said that the art of management should become part and parcel of Soviet intellectual potential.

Many years of the administrative-command system had a disastrous effect on the development of managerial talent. It is a crime ruinous for society to neglect its potential. It must be focussed on creating an economic mechanism ruling out economic absurdities and automatically rejecting poor quality labour.

The USSR Union of Managers aims to create favourable conditions for the promotion of business enterprise and initiative of specialists and scientists in the sphere of production, organisation and management, in commerce and business, for revealing their intellectual abilities.

Priority attention will be given to the problem of finding and choosing the best managerial ideas and schemes, suggested by members of the Union of Managers, of rallying broad public support to everything that is new and advanced, that tends to accelerate socio-economic progress.

The union plans to organise public scrutiny of major legislative acts linked with managerial and socio-economic problems. Its board will draw up appropriate conclusions and, if necessary, alternative versions.

The congress, which will continue until October 15, discussed the organisation's charter and elected Professor Vladimir Groshev president of the new union.

RSFSR Trade Union Congress Set for March 1990

LD0610230189 Moscow TASS in English 2212 GMT 6 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 6 TASS—Constituent congress of Russia's trade unions is scheduled to be held in Moscow from 21 to 23 March, 1990. This decision was taken here today at the first meeting of the organising committee which is to prepare the congress.

Up till now, unlike other republics which have their own trade union organisations, the trade unions of Russia—the largest republic of the USSR, reported directly to the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU).

It was decided that elections to the congress will be held in accordance with the territorial and sectoral principle. Half of the 300 delegates of the congress will be from territories and regions and the rest from different sectors.

The establishment of trade unions of Russia will be a reflection of a broad process of shaping new social and political structures in the USSR within the framework of perestroyka.

Union Writers 'Outraged' by 'Insult' to Russians

PM1210143189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[G. Orekhanova report: "Postscript to a Rejoinder"]

[Text] As readers know from the rejoinder "It Is Awkward..." published in our newspaper on 6 October, a resolution was adopted at an extended session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Writers' Union Secretariat to postpone the planned discussion on the work of the RSFSR Writers' Union organ, the journal OKTYABR, which did not take place on 5 October because the editorial board and the chief editor, A.A. Ananyev, failed to appear. However, the rescheduled discussion, with Russia's well-known writers in attendance, did not take place either, for the same reason. Having discussed the situation which had arisen, the secretariat took a decision to hold a plenum of the RSFSR Writers' Union Board on 15 November, with editorial and publishing problems in its press organs, including OKTYABR, on the agenda.

Speakers at the session were M. Alekseyev, S. Shurtakov, M. Godenko, V. Krupin, A. Keshokov, P. Proskurin, A. Salutskiy, V. Sorokin, Ye. Isayev, A. Salutskiy, A. Sofronov, N. Damdinov, T. Glushkova, A. Larionov, F. Chuyev, M. Shevchenko, St. Kunyayev, V. Bondarenko, D. Ilin, and V. Kochetkov... Deep anxiety about the current situation in literature could be heard in every speech. In particular, the question of the publication of an essay in the journal OKTYABR, written by A. Sinyavskiy (Abram Terts), "Excursions with Pushkin," which provoked many critical responses from readers, and also the attempt on the part of some bodies to stir up an unhealthy ballyhoo around this publication...

In this connection Nikolay Shundik, secretary of the RSFSR Writers' Union Board, said the following:

"The journal OKTYABR has always been a Soviet Russian periodical and it has rendered great service to our country's literature. We must do everything we can to stop it from becoming the mouthpiece of so-called

'outre' thinking in the Sinyavskiy style—essentially, distorted thinking. Sinyavskiy's system of discussion in his lampoon 'Excursions with Pushkin,' parts of which were published in OKTYABR, aims to defile the very spirit of Pushkin's poetry. 'Judging from Pushkin,' Sinyavskiy states, 'art is linked to life by death, sin, and lawlessness. Art itself is complete lawlessness, provoked by the emptiness of a lifeless house and a walking corpse.' Indeed, how is it that his colleagues at OKTYABR did not see the utter monstrosity of such an opinion?!

"And you need not accuse me of being opposed to freedom of the creative spirit. I am opposed to the idea of that great manifestation of the creative spirit—the genius of Pushkin—being so blasphemously called 'the emptiness of a lifeless house and a walking corpse'! You can see who is really encroaching on freedom of speech and creativity. When nothing remains sacred, the danger emerges of the fiercest dictatorship of pseudorevolutionaries and their inevitable obscurantism. 'Pseudo' articles always court disaster, because those who write them compromise, disfigure, and reduce to absurdity the things that they are apparently standing up for in their loud declarations. Democracy must be saved from pseudodemocracy."

This idea was supported and developed by the well-known Tatar writer, USSR People's Deputy Tufan Minnullin, in his address:

"I am in complete agreement with those who deem it necessary to question the position of the journal OKTYABR with respect to Russian national sanctities. At issue is the insult to Aleksandr Sergeyevich Pushkin, the pride and leading light of the Russian people, in A. Sinyavskiy's article. I believe that this question must be put forward for discussion at a Russian Writers' Union Board plenum. I wholly share the indignation of Russian people, and even more so, Russian writers, who have stood up to defend the merits of Pushkin. If someone insulted a native Tatar writer in this manner, I would be infinitely outraged. A conclusion must be drawn about the development of the present events: Now we must not only discuss the literary standard of the periodical, but also general morality and writers' responsibility to the people. No talk of pluralism can justify the fact that the pages of OKTYABR were devoted to putting forward ideas that deeply offended feelings of national dignity. I believe that the question of the role that Russian periodicals must play in strengthening our unity should be included on the agenda at our writers' plenum. I see it as a great misfortune that the aim of some writers is to cause interethnic strife and break up our Soviet motherland through their work.

"I believe that, in discussing these questions, we should not leave out the collective letter published recently in one of the papers in defense of the journal's position in this matter. After all, it talks about our Soviet literature and the writer's honor. I deem it unworthy of the people who signed to turn our great literature into a political football, belittling the national dignity of the peoples living on Russian soil....

Vlasov Addresses RSFSR Council Session

LD0610221289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 6 Oct 89

[Excerpts] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers has studied the tasks of the state and economic organs of the republic with regard to implementing the decision of the CPSU Central Committee of 8 September 1989 on the fulfillment of the program of social construction in the RSFSR. [passage omitted]

Comrade Vlasov spoke during the meeting. Comrades Vorotnikov and Usmanov took part in the work of the meeting.

RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Formed

18000002 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Unsigned report: "In the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet".]

[Text] For the purpose of raising the effectiveness of the direction of the organs of internal affairs and improving the coordination with other government organs and social organizations of the Russian Federation for the strengthening of law and order and the prevention of violations of the law in the republic, the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has formed a union-republic RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Republics Urged to Protect Minority Rights

18001589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Legal Sciences M. Puchkova, senior research associate at the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "The Right to Equal Rights"]

[Text] Under contemporary conditions, ensuring and defending the rights of nationalities which reside outside the confines of their state and territorial entities or do not have such entities has become an acute problem. At issue are almost 60 million persons among whom there are several ethnic groups with their level of development of native language and culture, their specific peculiarities and needs. These are also citizens residing outside the boundaries of corresponding union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs (the Ukrainians and Russians in Belorussia, Tatars in Bashkiria, Russians and Belorussians in the Baltic area). These are also the representatives of nationalities which have their national-state entities abroad (the Germans, Poles, Bulgarians, Hungarians, and so on). These are also the people belonging to nationalities for which the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics is their historical motherland, though they do not have their state-terrotorial entities (the Gagauz, Veps, some ethnic groups of the Far North). Finally, one more group consists of those who used to be registered separately but after 1926 began to be registered as representatives of other nationalities (for example, the Krashens and others).

Ensuring equal rights for all nationalities, large and small, was one of the most significant requirements of Lenin's program for resolving the nationalities issue. Much attention was paid to this in the initial years of soviet power. Autonomous administrative territorial units, such as national rural soviets, settlement soviets, rayons, and okrugs, were formed. Besides, special state organs or their subdivisions were also created: the Department of National Minorities at the National Commissariat for Nationality Affairs, and later, national minority departments at the presidiums of kray and oblast executive committees, and commissioners for national minorities at kray, oblast, and provincial executive committees. However, in the 1930's and 1940's the elimination of the above institutions began; emphasis on the socio-economic and cultural needs and requirements of nationality groups became weaker; conditions necessary for their comprehensive development were not being created. Cases of restricting and violating the rights of citizens became more frequent as a result of distorting Lenin's nationality policy.

At present, the movement of "national minorities" for their rights is growing throughout the world, and the interest in their problems shown by statesmen, scientists, and the public is increasing. The democratization and renewal of the Soviet society have facilitated considerable growth of awareness of nationality groups in our country as well. Therefore, it is no accident that the Final Document of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states-participants in the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe sets forth that these states, including the USSR, assume the obligation to "ensure that the status of persons belonging to national minorities or regional cultures in their territories is equal to the status which other citizens enjoy..."

The draft CPSU Platform "Nationality Policy of the Party Under Contemporary Conditions" sets the task of "ensuring all rights and conditions for the preservation of national traditions, development of the culture and language of the peoples which live outside their national-territorial entities or do not have such entities within the USSR and their representation in the organs of power."

Proceeding on the course set by the resolution of the 19th All-Union Party Conference "On Interethnic Relations," the CPSU is envisaging at present a number of specific constructive measures, which, to our mind, merit support. At the same time, they need development, specification, and additions.

Problems which have accumulated in this sphere are associated with creating a system of legislation on the rights of nationality groups and guarantees of these rights which comply with modern requirements. The point is that there are no articles devoted especially to the legal status of these groups in the 1977 USSR Constitution, in the 1978 constitutions of union and autonomous republics, in the constitutions previously in effect, or laws on the rights of citizens; almost nothing is said about the obligations of the organs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the republics with regard to them. Only very recently has the situation begun changing for the better. This has been reflected primarily in the USSR Law "On Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law)" dated 1 December 1988. Pursuant to Article 116, "issues of ensuring national equality, the interests of nationalities, nations, and nationality groups in combination with the general interests and needs of the Soviet multinational state are subject to consideration primarily in the Soviet of Nationalities."

In this reference, it appears necessary to envisage in the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of union and autonomous republics the responsibility of the supreme organs of power and governance of the USSR and the republics for ensuring and defending the rights of all natinality groups residing in their territory and for creating conditions for the free ethnic development of these groups. In this case, the union republic is to play a special role. In our opinion, the supreme organs of power and governance of the republic should assume complete responsibility for all peoples within its confines, even the smallest one, not feeling infringed upon primarily in terms of political rights and freedoms.

Preparing special laws on the legal status of nationality groups is long overdue. This was also reflected in the CPSU Platform which envisages adopting the USSR Law "On Guarantees for the Rights of Citizens Residing Outside the Confines of Their State-Territorial Entities or Not Having Them in the Territory of the USSR." In our opinion, it would be feasible to name this law more precisely, specifically, "On the Legal Status of Nationality Groups Residing in the USSR," because it should refer primarily to the community of people belonging to a particular nationality rather than a particular individual.

Such laws are also needed in the republics. Certain steps in this direction have already been taken on the initiative of republics themselves. Thus, the Daugavpils Rayon Committee of the Latvian Communist Party has made a proposal concerning the need to develop the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Law "On Legal Guarantees for Nationality Groups." At present, similar laws are in effect in a number of foreign states (for example, in Austria and Czechoslovakia).

It is expedient to set forth in the USSR Law "On the Legal Status of Nationality Groups Residing in the USSR" their rights and guarantees of these rights in various spheres of state and social activities which are needed for their free development. It is important to first

of all grant to the nationality groups the right to preserve and develop their native language and to use it in official establishments in the territory of clustered settlement of a given nationality, the right to preserve and develop national culture, traditions, and crafts; the right to have press organs in their native languages; the right to set up ethnic, cultural, social organizations and other organs of social self-government; the right to the protection of their habitat. To our minds, it is necessary to reflect at the legislative level the CPSU policy of ensuring "the representation in the organs of power, government, courts, and the procuracy, in the management of economic and socio-cultural establishments of all peoples residing in the country and in every republic taking into account the business and professional qualities of individuals," as envisaged by the platform.

Improving autonomous territorial units forms the second group of problems. Autonomous oblasts and autonomous okrugs exist at present; however, life indicates that this is definitely inadequate. New, smaller autonomous entities are needed. In this matter, it would be expedient to refer to the historical experience of our country, in particular, to the 1920's, when national rayons, national settlement soviets, and rural soviets were created. Many issues in the sphere of developing the language and culture of national minorities were resolved through them. The platform provides for "setting up national rayons, rural, and settlement soviets in the areas of clustered settlement of nationalities which do not have their national-territorial entities." This position is quite justified, and in the future USSR and republic laws a new regulation of this kind could be established, and the main conditions for forming the above autonomous units could be set forth. Incidentally, such a national-territorial entity, Even-Bytantay National Rayon, was created very recently in the Yakutsk ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] for a small ethnic group, the Evens, by a decree of the Presidium of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet.

It is necessary to consider a democratic procedure for setting up such rayons, rural soviets, and settlement soviets for the nationality groups which reside outside the confines of their union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs, if a majority of representatives of these groups indicate that they desire this, if an agreement is reached with the representatives of the nationality for which the republic is named, and their interests will not be infringed upon.

At present, the issue of what to do with cities in which a majority of the population does not belong to the indigenous nationality arises. The city of Daugavpils in the Latvian SSR, in which the population of the non-indigenous nationality accounts for 87 percent, is a case in point. Among other things, proposals for creating in this city a national soviet were put forth in the Latvian press. Similar situations may develop at other locations. Unfortunately, this complex issue has not been elaborated on in theory. As is known, there have not been localities with the status of a "national city" in the history of our country. Apparently, this has happened because the cities have never been ethnically homogeneous. What are the ways for ensuring the development and interests of all nationalities under such conditions? To our minds, we should use the potential of the city soviets of people's deputies more rationally. Among other things, it is important to set forth their powers in the sphere of interethnic relations, including those in safeguarding and protecting the interests of all nationality groups residing in a given territory and in the laws on local self-government and local economy.

Apparently, it is necessary for the CPSU platform to also touch on the issue of providing an opportunity for nationalities which do not have their own state-territorial entities to form not only national rayons, rural soviets, and settlement soviets, but, taking into account specific conditions, also autonomous oblasts and okrugs. In practice, such cases are already coming up. Thus, the Presidium of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet has set up a commission in order to study inquiries by USSR people's deputies and other petitions concerning the creation of an autonomous unit for the Gagauz people.

Representation of nationality groups in the organs of state power forms one more group of problems. Under the contemporary conditions of democratizing our society, it is important to ensure the right of every people, regardless of its numerical strength, to have its representatives in the supreme organs of power of the USSR and the republics, as well as to take part in resolving the issues of state. Along these lines, it is possible, for example, to form a second chamber (Soviet of Nationalities) in the supreme soviets of union and autonomous republics. (Even now the issue of forming such a chamber in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is being discussed).

It is said in the text of the draft CPSU platform that "the transition to alternative system of nominating and electing deputies which is now under way may bring about the loss or restriction of representation in the republic organs of power of some peoples; thought should be given to creating a special mechanism capable of compensating for this phenomenon." With this in view, the setting up of a special organ at the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Representatives of nationality groups residing in the republic may be considered in republics where the second chamber is not created.

Similar institutions exist in foreign countries. For example, councils of national minorities are created in Austria at the office of the federal chancellor for advising the federal government and ministers. Naturally, they consist of representatives of these national minorities. Under our conditions, it would be expedient to create a similar organ at the supreme organ of state power in the republics. Members of the council of representatives of nationality groups could be elected by an open or secret vote at a meeting or conference of every group. The council would become the supreme organ of social

self-government of nationality groups, and would represent the economic, social, and cultural interests of the populace in the supreme organ of power of the republic. It would have the authority to put on the agenda of the Supreme Soviet session and the meetings of its organs issues involving a particular group, would take part in the discussion of draft laws and social programs affecting the rights and interests of national minorities, and would state its opinion of them. It would also be expedient to give this council the right of legislative initiative with regard to issues affecting the rights of nationality groups, as well as with a view to creating conditions for implementing these rights.

Similar organs could be created at the local soviets of people's deputies, especially in cities with ethnically diverse populations. They could study the public opinion, requirements, and needs of the people. We believe that this organ of social self-government could accomplish much not only in safeguarding and protecting the interests of every nationality group but also in establishing mutual understanding and trust among various nationalities, and would facilitate the development of internationalism.

Odessa Military District Political Work Noted

PM1210112789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "At the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate": "To See Realities and Act Accordingly"]

[Text] The Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate Bureau has discussed the question of the work of the Odessa Military District Political Directorate and political organs in enhancing the militancy of primary party organizations in the ideological life of military collectives under the conditions of the sociopolitical situation which has taken shape in the region. The report by Lieutenant General V. Plekhanov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Odessa Military District Political Directorate, was heard.

It was pointed out that the district Political Directorate and political organs, proceeding from the CPSU Central Committee guidelines on mastering political methods of leadership, are taking definite measures to enhance the role of primary party organizations in educating and uniting military collectives and mobilizing them to resolve tasks of combat readiness. The ideological life of party organizations and their influence on the masses of servicemen are being coordinated increasingly closely with the processes which are occurring in the country and the Armed Forces under the impact of perestroyka. Account is taken here of the sociopolitical situation taking shape in the places where troops are directly stationed.

Under these conditions the Political Directorate and political organs are actively seeking forms and methods appropriate to the situation in the region for cooperation between unit and subunit party organizations and local party and soviet organs, particularly in questions of the military-patriotic education of predraft young people and the population, the exchange of information, and the formulation of joint measures to respond to people's sentiments.

To these ends groups for the prompt political briefing of personnel are functioning in certain combined units on the basis of directorate party organizations, while party committees and bureaus are taking steps to enhance the political culture of Communists and also to employ active forms for their Marxist-Leninist education and for the orientation of the party and ideological aktiv with regard to the most important party-wide and political issues. On the whole, the level of ideological work in the district ensures the conscientious attitude of Communists and the majority of personnel to the fulfillment of their military duty.

At the same time it was pointed out at the bureau session that the Political Directorate does not pursue persistently and consistently enough the line of enhancing the militancy of party organizations in the ideological life of military collectives with due regard for the complex processes occurring within them. Not everywhere do political organs regard party organizations as the leading ideological force of military collectives which must be relied on in all political and ideological work among the masses of servicemen under the conditions of the rapidly changing sociopolitical situation in the regions and the moral and psychological climate in collectives. For this reason certain political organs and party committees and bureaus devote insufficient attention to the ideological training of Communists and are slow to improve the content, forms, and methods of party organizations' ideological activity. Many secretaries of party committees and bureaus have a poor grasp of the methods of organizing ideological work and do not have a clear picture of ways to turn the party organization into a center of ideological educational work. Individual ones do not display political initiative and respond with considerable delay to events which occur. The institution of deputy secretaries of party organizations for ideological work is making a poor showing.

Certain party organizations have relaxed attention toward all-party documents and do not practice collective discussion of materials published in the press or the formulation of a common opinion on them. The level of organization and the methods of conducting political studies lag behind modern requirements and poorly develop in Communists new political thinking and culture and an interest in the study of works by the classics of Marxism-Leninism and in articles in the party and military press. In a number of units and combined units the activeness of Communists' addresses to the personnel has diminished, while individual Communists display uncertainty and fear of the masses in the situation of people's increased politicization.

Inadequate concern for the authority and the vanguard role of Communists in service and in ideological life has an adverse effect on the successes of many military collectives.

The Main Political Directorate Bureau obliged the District Political Directorate to make a critical assessment of its activity in implementing the CPSU Central Committee guidelines on mastering political methods of leadership, and more persistently and consistently to carry out work aimed at enhancing the authority of party organizations and their role in the ideological and political education of Communists and all personnel with due regard for the processes occurring in the party, in the country, and in the Armed Forces and under the conditions of the sociopolitical situation taking shape in the places where troops are directly stationed and the moral and psychological climate in military collectives. To these ends it is necessary to amend the political organs' programs for renewing the ideological activity of party organizations, to actualize the content, proceeding from modern demands for priority for the ideological educational functions of party organizations, and to bring their organizational and ideological work into dialectical unity by pooling the efforts of the political directorate's departments and of all ideological and party organizational workers so as to implement this guideline. It is necessary more frequently to analyze the development of these processes in work in subordinate political organs and party organizations, promptly introduce the accumulated positive experience, and regularly submit these questions for the discussion and elaboration of measures on courses with various categories of political workers and the party and ideological aktiv. It is recommended that joint conferences of ideological and party organizational workers and party committee and bureau secretaries be held on these questions with the participation of local party organ workers.

Special attention was drawn to enhancing the responsibility of primary political organs and their chiefs, as the direct organizers of party work, for competent leadership of party organizations and enhancing their role in the ideological life of military collectives. It is necessary to submit more boldly for discussion by Communists key sociopolitical problems, particularly with regard to questions of the place and role of the CPSU in perestroyka and society, the concept of the renewal of socialism and ways to carry it out, interethnic relations, the party's military policy, and others, with a view to determining the general position of party members on them, fostering in them a sense of personal involvement in the elaboration of all-party programs, and removing uncertainty and fear of the masses. Through Communists working in Lenin Communist Youth League, trade union, and other public organizations and ideological formations it is necessary to increase their ideological influence on military collectives and take prompt measures of an ideological nature to remove the acute problems and questions that arise on the basis of maintaining constant ties with the masses of servicemen and analyzing their sentiments. It is time to decisively abandon obsolete forms and methods of influencing people which do not accord with the spirit of the time, to make an abrupt turn toward individualizing education, and to carry it out with due regard for special features of the psychology and thinking of various categories of servicemen and the sociopolitical processes occurring in places where troops are stationed, as well as in the regions from which they were drafted.

Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, summed up the results of the discussion. He emphasized the need for further creative work by Army and Navy political directorates and political organs in persistently mastering political leadership methods and enhancing in this connection the role of primary party organizations as centers of the ideological life of military collectives and for special attention to resolving a problem raised for examination by first persons—chiefs of political organs at all levels. It was recommended that these questions be discussed with party organizational and ideological workers on the upcoming courses in connection with the start of the new training year.

Attention was drawn to the decisive restructuring of work in connection with the decision to convene the 28th party congress and with the CPSU platform "Nationalities Policy of the Party Under Present Conditions," which were adopted at the CPSU Central Committee September (1989) Plenum. Every political organ and party organization must have a practical action program in which to define the main stages of the preparations for the CPSU congress and to provide for measures aimed at renewing the ideological life of party organizations themselves and widely discussing the most urgent and complex questions, above all on the place and role of the party in perestroyka and society, on ways to enhance its authority, on the vanguard role of Communists, on the CPSU Statutes and a change in their provisions for the purpose of renewing the party itself, and others in order, during these party discussions, to lift pessimistic sentiments and uncertainty from a certain section of Communists and to form in them an active public stance and firm ideological conviction as to the consolidating role of the party as the political vanguard of society at the contemporary stage.

The elections to republic and local soviets will be an important juncture in the activity of political organs and party organizations. Their results and the sociopolitical and moral climate in military collectives, Army General A. Lizichev pointed out, will be criteria for the effectiveness of the ideological work being done. This will not be an easy stage. Therefore political organs must have a delicate feel for the situation in the region and in military collectives, forecast events, and work with anticipation. It is necessary to enhance assertiveness in the struggle against manifestations of alien ideology and against antiparty, antisocialist, and anti-Army sentiments and to foster in Communists and all personnel high political vigilance and constant readiness to fulfill their military duty of defending the socialist homeland.

Non-Native Migration From Tajikistan Reported

18300854 Moscow SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 22 Sep 89 p 2

[Mir XX Press Service report: "Tajikistan"]

[Text] According to reports from Tajikistan, migration is on the rise. In the first half of the current year alone, around 10,000 people of nonindigenous nationalities left Dushanbe. Migrational 'damages' are assessed at over 3,000 people, almost a third of which are specialists with a higher education, and many are highly qualified workers with various specialties. The drain of specialists from production collectives has already impacted negatively on the activities of several enterprises.

Those leaving give as their basic reason the fact that the state language has been declared to be Tajik in the republic. Many are not sure how it would be possible to live and work normally under conditions where the Tajik language is practically in universal use. They also fear repetition of the situation that is currently taking shape in the Baltics and Moldavia.

Foreign Broadcast Chief Speaks on Perestroyka

LD0610112989 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1700 GMT 22 Sep 89

["Hello, Bratislava" program]

[Excerpts] This October we will commemmorate the 60th anniversary of the Moscow radio foreign broadcasting. [passage omitted]

[First Announcer] What is Moscow radio's role in the current stage of restructuring? This question will be answered by Aleksandr Plevako, chief of Moscow radio foreign broadcasting. Opening an exhibition devoted to our anniversary; he said:

[Begin Plevako recording in Russian, fading to superimposed Slovak translation] People switch on their radios all around the world daily to hear what Moscow radio has to say about the extensive processes of restructuring, how more and more people are won over by new political thinking, what Gorbachev says and does. These changes affected Soviet radio. It became a mediator of trust among nations. We really try to speak the truth about the events in the country without embellishment. [end recording]

[First Announcer] As I listen to Aleksandr Sergeyevich, I recall the days when he was the head of our editorial office. How many interesting bulletins were created after his arrival. How much zeal we had! The secret lies, perhaps, in the fact that the head of foreign broadcasting is a born broadcaster. It can be said, using sailors' slang, that he achieved the position of captain straight from below decks.

[Second Announcer] I personally find it important that I can tell the boss today: In my view...That is, that I can hold a view on my own. When a SOBESEDNIK reporter asked Plevako whether his staff had the right to their own views which might differ from the official one, he said firmly: In my view, they must have it.

The reaction of our political leadership to this or that sometimes is not even pronounced immediately, and is not so prompt as we would want. The listeners, however, are not used to waiting and therefore we voice our own opinion. The commentator says that in a situation like this: I do not know what the official view is, but in my view... [passage omitted]

Nationality Writings From PRAVDA Collected

18300853 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 Second Edition p 6

[Report by S. Nesterov: "New Books: 'USSR: Our Common Home'"]

[Text] "Pravda" Press has issued a book with this title, encompassing the publications from the newspaper PRAVDA on nationality relations in our country.

By itself the title is not revealing. We have known for a long time that the USSR is homeland to all the nationalities and peoples living within the boundaries of our state. And we are sure, despite all the false rumors about a separate residency for each nationality that is delineated by high fences, we are sure that the USSR really is a common home, an indissoluble union, thanks to the benefits and fateful inevitability of socialism. And this idea has been sounded with new strength at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum which has just taken place.

In the book the authors and heroes of PRAVDA speak out under one flag. These are people of the most varied nationalities and positions. Naturally, they have a variety of views.

"Perestroyka," we quote the book, "democratization, and glasnost illuminate a number of questions to which little attention was paid earlier—questions, for example, of language, development of national culture and art, ecology, the protection of monuments. It is no secret to anyone that the facts of national egoism and conceit, dependent moods and regionalism continue..."

The book "USSR: Our Common Home" will, it goes without saying, facilitate the strengthening of friendship between nationalities and peoples.

New Goskompriroda Chairman Vorontsov Interviewed

18300796 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 2 Sep 89 p 4

[Interview with N.N. Vorontsov, people's deputy and incoming chairman of the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection, conducted by

SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent A. Gasparyan: "Ecological Diktat in the Epoch of Democratization"; date, place and occasion of interview not specified]

[Text] [Gasparyan] Nikolay Nikolayevich, just 10 years or so ago we had a greater understanding of the ecological problems of a given geographical area. We addressed the fact that our forests, rivers, and lakes were being destroyed and slipping out of man's control. Our main topic of conversation today has become the issue of human life—we are beginning to realize more and more that it is you and I who are the principle victims of the terror of technology. How did we get here? What is the reason that mankind has turned into a monster devouring its very own self?

[Vorontsov] We must understand our place in living nature. For many years we lived as prisoners of the fascinating slogan "Everything for man, everything in the name of man, everything for the good of man." But what does "everything" mean? All resources? And what do we mean by the "good" of man? Is that the good of you and me? Or is it the good of all mankind now living? Or is it also the good of our children and grandchildren? Today we are already beginning to sense what has come of this. Life is in jeopardy. The very statement of the problem, "man and the biosphere," as my teacher N.V. Timofeyev-Resovskiy used to say, is incorrect. It would be more accurate to say "the biosphere and mankind." We live in the biosphere and occupy a certain place in it. Are we aware that almost all the minerals we use today are the product of past biospheres? Of course man is transforming the biosphere—he is exchanging natural associations into agricultural associations, zoo- and phytocoenosis into agro-coenosis, etc. But everything has its limits. And if man wishes to survive, he must wisely use the interest he gets from the capital afforded by living nature. And this interest differs everywhere—certain regions are characterized by a high degree of biological productivity, others by a degree not so high.

With regard to what you have termed the terror of technology, I would prefer to call it technocratic terror. And there are many reasons for this, not the least important of which is the ideology arising at the beginning of the century of comparing human progress with the amount of available energy, with the quantity of coal brought to the surface, etc. We recall the work of cartoonists at the beginning of the century, especially of German cartoonists who depicted coal heaps, smokestacks and mine-drilling equipment, and in the midst of this—man, crushed by such industrial power. But at the same time one senses in these cartoons an enrapturement at this power. This kind of technocratic ideology linking progress primarily with the advent of technology spread quite naturally to our country as well, especially during the years of the first 5-year plans and industrialization.

It seems we are going to transfer entirely to industrial methods of agriculture—we will be building city-gardens. Incidentally, a very recent example of such technocratic thinking is the creation of gigantic industrial farms for fattening cattle without the use of pasture. Still we continue to think that progress is related to mankind's ruthless assault on nature while the West has already squeezed out its fruits. The pollution in Chicago and the Ruhr, Birmingham and Glasgow blackened over with smoke—all this relates to the prewar years. An active movement began in the West as long ago as the middle of the 1950's to attempt to harmonize man's relations with his surrounding environment. There began a large-scale resettlement of city dwellers to the suburbs. But we see that technocratic thinking is alive and well here today, although interest has grown in matters of protecting the environment—both on the state and social-movement level.

We should remember one thing more. Air and water purity is not primordial. In other words, the rivers have always carried sediment and the remains of dead organisms. Yet the lake into which such a river flows is clean for some reason. For example, the Moscow River near Kolomna flows into the Oka, and the Oka cleanses itself over the course of a certain number of kilometers and digests even that terrible amount of filth which is discarded by a city of 10 million. Thus, water purification is a biogenic process and the result of the activity of many millions of organisms. Our soil too is not a present from God, but a product of the interaction between living and nonliving nature. And what about the process of air self-purification? Only if we come to understand man's place in these processes and refrain from violating them will it be possible for mankind to have some kind of normal life without passing on inherited sicknesses, without increasing oncological diseases, without increasing disorders of the circulatory and nervous systems related to stress in urban areas, etc.

[Gasparyan] What is more important today, in your opinion, in solving problems related to the ecology? Increasing environmental-protection legislation and making it more stringent? Or raising our cultural level—not only ecological culture but culture in the broadest sense of the word? It is evident that ignorance and a lack of culture comprise the cause of many of our ills, especially in the sphere of environmental protection.

[Vorontsov] It is difficult to say what is more important. Certainly culture is important, primarily because culture determines man's relationship to life without regard to the law. A cultured person does not violate the law because he possesses a certain system of internal values. But we must also think about regulation by law, for a good law can have tremendous educational significance. I addressed this matter in my speech before a session of the Supreme Soviet. We should understand that from 1939 through 1967 it was not simply poor biology which was taught in Soviet schools, but antibiology. In essence it was a Lysenkoist course. And all those people who are now 38 to 66 years old received their education based on

the slogan "We cannot wait for nice things to come from nature—we must seize them from it. That is our task." We recall the old films and the great joy with which they depicted forests being felled. This is simply a celebration of power....

Thus it is necessary, of course, to effect ecological refresher training for vast layers of the adult population. There is no way to get around it. But certainly we must also engage in ecological upbringing, cultural upbringing.

Insofar as I am also a member of the Committee on Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Academician D.S. Likhachev and I have the job of preparing a report for the committee on the state of library and museum affairs in the country. We have many matters to take care of dealing with the Hermitage and the Tretyakov, but I would like to point out that there is colossal value to be found in our smaller museums—the oblast, rayon and local level.

With respect to depositories, the herbarium situation in our country is quite alarming to me as a specialist in this area. After all, a herbarium is the same thing as a library. Also exceedingly alarming is the situation with respect to our vast depository of zoological collections. The Zoological Institute Museum of the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad is our third most visited museum after the Hermitage and the Russian Museum. But if you make the calculation based on unit of floor space, it becomes the most visited museum, since its area is incomparably less than that of the Hermitage. Yet it is in such a state that fire department authorities might close the institute at any time.

I am also alarmed at the catastrophic situation of our oldest greenhouses, at the botanical gardens of the Botanical Institute of the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad. These greenhouses hold tropical plants which survived the cold of the blockade! But the building is not undergoing any repair and an extremely rare collection is under threat of extinction. This is the level of our culture today. I must also address the situation with respect to our zoos. Every zoo has more than cultural significance—it also comprises the stock reserve of those genus varieties threatened by extinction. We treat our zoos in terrible fashion, not only as compared with the capitalist countries but with the other socialist countries as well. Frankly I find it hard to understand the position taken by the inhabitants of the region near Bittsevsk Forest Park who flatly object to the construction of a zoo here. Zoos appear in all cities of the world—they are the pride of a city and a place to relax.

You asked about legislation. We must reexamine the entirety of the economics associated with environmental protection. We need laws which would make it unprofitable to pollute the environment, not just a system of fines and penalties, but one in which an enterprise would be rewarded for energy and resource conservation. We must remember that resources are finite. Several generations have been brought up in the understanding that they are infinite, that any other psychology represents Malthusianism. In fact, we must develop an understanding as to the ecological capacity of the environment.

[Gasparyan] I have to confess that I have never come across this term in any publication. What does "ecological capacity" mean?

[Vorontsov] Let me cite an example. We currently have a cellulose combine situated between Vyborg and Ladoga. The Finns have constructed a large enterprise of their own near the border and I think this was no accident. They knew full well that the wind blows from west to east and that all the airborne waste products will therefore travel to us. They are also preparing to construct a plant there for the production of formic acid. No matter how stringent we make the maximum permissible concentration levels for each individual enterprise, the environment cannot handle everything it discharges into the water and air. The environment simply will not process these waste products.

It is unfortunate that we still do not have a good concept of ecological capacity.

Yet another problem requires special attention today—the problem of prioritized rights of local populations, primarily of peoples small in number, to nondepleting use of nature. They must be assured that their land will not be taken away from them or destroyed. We see a catastrophic reduction today in the amount of deer-grazing land in Yamal. With the "help" of the oil industry and Ministry of Geology, 6 million hectares of deer-grazing land has been destroyed in recent years. If we calculate based on the least expensive cost—R1,000 per hectare—this means that R6 billion worth of damage has been done. The cost of Chernobyl is estimated at R8 billion. And whereas today everything is known about Chernobyl, the situation regarding the deer-grazing land remains unpunished. If we take into account the cost of recultivating the land, damages might be estimated at R90 billion. In order to be able to imagine what that is, let me just say that our country's total expenditures for defense this year amounted to R77.3 billion. This is the cost of our departmental barbarity.

[Gasparyan] The figures are horrifying. But these losses are not measured only in rubles. Obviously we need a fundamentally new ecological policy, a new, systemic approach which takes into account the diversity of traditions, national cultures, landscapes, and species...

[Vorontsov] Of course. Unless we struggle to preserve landscape and species population diversity, we will achieve nothing. Every individual strives to live in a stable environment. This stability applies to both the ecological and the social environment. We know full well that the most stable natural systems are those which have the greatest number of varieties. But if we analyze and compare natural and social systems, we find that they have a great deal in common. Such systems can exist if they are diverse and have direct linkage and feedback. It

must be said that over the course of this decade we have seen a catastrophic loss of diversity at all levels, natural and social, and this has led to their instability.

Today when we address environmental protection issues, we realize that we have lost species diversity in our natural resources. Dozens of varieties of plants, animals, and microorganisms are disappearing. And it is not just these losses in themselves. It is not simply what evolution has accumulated over millions of years that is disappearing. These losses have led to a situation in which natural associations have become unstable. They are unable to function normally. Here is an example. We know that a forest not subjected to city waste carries out photosynthetic activity at a level four times that of a wooded area in the city. This can be explained not only through tetraethyl concentrations, but also by the fact that city parks are significantly poorer than country woods in terms of species composition. Everywhere we look, I would say, we are witnessing an unrefined approach to agriculture. We have lost vast amounts of local crop varieties and domestic animal species.

Let me cite another example. We have varieties of indigenous cattle which are quite remarkable—the astounding Yakut cattle, for example, which have adapted to very low temperatures with large amounts of fat but naturally a low milk-producing abilit. This remarkable breed of cattle has now begun to disappear. West European and other hybrid varieties have begun to crowd it out. It has reached the point where, upon studying this breed in the Yakut region, they had to go to a nursery of the Novosibirsk Institute of Cytology and Genetics to get them.

Landscape diversity is also being lost. We see the thoughtless draining of swampland, the disappearance of steppe landscape, the cutting down of shrubbery in the Non-Chernozem Zone and forested regions of Moldavia. All of this is being replaced with endless fields of monoculture. As a result, the cotton monoculture in Central Asia has become one of the main causes of the calamities—if not tragedies—which have befallen the region. This is because the monoculture can be sustained only by stimulation through the use of chemicals, "repression" in other words.

Nor can we fail to address the loss of man's ecological diversity. It should be noted that ethnographic and ecological ignorance are closely related to one another. In the 1920's and 1930's attempts were made to force a sedentary lifestyle on peoples who were nomads and hunters from the earliest times. The situation has been especially alarming for the sparse populations of the North, of which only about 150,000 individuals remain across these vast territories.

We are also aware that we lost national diversity too over the course of many years. Official records indicate that in 1926 we comprised 194 nationalities. But in 1979 there were only 101. Where did the other 93 disappear to? They were artificially amalgamated with others. The practice arose of registering small ethnic groups within the composition of large ones. This leads not only to cultural losses, but to grave ecological consequences as well. Every people dwelling in a certain region is living in harmony with the surrounding environment. It can be engaged, as a rule, in the nondepleting use of nature. Today the Nentsy of Yamal and the Khanty and Mansy of Western Siberia find themselves in a tragic state. Fortunately, construction of the Turukhanskaya Hydropower Plant is no longer scheduled, although planning and design continue. This construction would encompass most of the hunting area of the Evenki people. The very fact that such planning is underway in a region inhabited by a people of sparse population constitutes a Sword of Damocles hanging over them. And it seems to me this is quite alarming.

[Gasparyan] And immoral as well, I would say...

[Vorontsov] It must be said that authorities with little culture find it easier to live under centralized conditions without any feedback. This entails a lack of respect for religious, cultural, ethnic, and language values. Such a lack of culture can lead to increased chauvinism and nationalism—this is what may come about when we fail to understand the significance of national diversity in its many forms.

[Gasparyan] Failing to understand the significance of national diversity has apparently led to a certain loss of tradition in a people's relationship with nature.

[Vorontsov] Without a doubt we have lost regional diversity in culture. The Russian, Ukrainian, Turkmen, and Uzbek peoples have been seriously affected in this regard. After all, what are Russians? They are Pomors and Kerzhaks, Upper Volga people who overpronounce their "o's," etc. Failure to consider regional cultural diversities constitutes failure to understand the importance of culture's link with ecology.

Spiritual aspects of Christianity, Islam, and other cultures have been lost. And of course it is impossible to condense the thousand-year-old cultures of, let us say, Armenia, Georgia, Rus, the peoples of Central Asia and the Baltic region, into something like the 70-year history of the USSR, no matter how important or interesting they might be. A false culture has been substituted for the real thing as a result of such orientation. Respect for personality has disappeared. I would like to say as a biologist that we should remember that when we talk about personality, we value first and foremost its uniqueness, its genetic, physiological, and psychological diversity. This is what constitutes the major value of the species of mankind.

The more diverse mankind is, the more powerful the population of his species. Failure to understand the significance of diversity and stability leads, in the final analysis, to a loss of culture. As a result, along with stereotyped education, architecture, and way of life, there arises a certain stereotyped anthropocentric

thinking: "Man is the center of the universe," "everything is for man." But at what price?

Anthropocentrism is directly related to ethnocentrism. In other words, "my ethnicity is higher than that of others." It is also related to sociocentrism: "My class is better than that of others."

[Gasparyan] And we know where this leads—or, more accurately, where it has led.

[Vorontsov] To a loss of humanism, to a technocratic way of thinking and the destruction of nature motivated to a painful degree by the familiar thesis, "for the sake of the welfare of man." In other words, the consequences of all of this—cultural, social, and ecological—are closely intertwined. The lack of system diversity at all levels and the absence of feedback have led us to the brink of ecological and social crisis.

[Gasparyan] So here we are saying that we need an ecological dictate to solve our ecological problems. But how does this tie in with the process of democratization and expanded freedoms, with the process of establishing a law-governed state? Is there not a contradiction here?

[Vorontsov] I think in this instance, if we are talking about a dictatorship, democratization will be able to create judicial and legal mechanisms which can be unwaveringly pursued. Let me give an example. These days we really love to say that we have a non-democratic society and they have a democratic society in the West. But in America just try to conceal some income and avoid paying tax on it. It's all over then! Within the framework of a heterogeneous society, within the framework of traditional democracy, there emerges a certain very rigid mechanism which compels unconditional payment of taxes. It is the same way in a number of other countries. It is for this reason in particular that America, the FRG, and Sweden have succeeded in resolving many ecological problems. Not long ago I was in Chicago. We all know from our childhood days that Chicago is a terribly polluted industrial city where you have filthy Lake Michigan, etc. As it turns out, everything there today is clean. They catch trout 40 kilometers from Chicago. It is precisely due to their legislation, their dictate—I'm not afraid to use the word—that very severe economic obstacles have been placed in the way of polluting the environment.

[Gasparyan] When you examine the letters we receive here at the newspaper, as well as reports that have been generally circulated by the mass media, you get the impression that our population has no legal protection from ecological disaster. Do we not lag behind the Western countries in this regard?

[Vorontsov] Well, you know, it is not necessary to idealize the Western system here either. In our country an individual who goes to court has little chance, on the one hand, of winning his case. On the other hand, he risks practically nothing in having done so. The situation is different in the West. An individual has the opportunity to see not just an ordinary lawyer, but one who specializes in health care or environmental protection issues, or to see the appropriate legal firm. Expenditures incurred in pursuing the legal process are tremendous but, on the other hand, the possibility of monetary gain is tempting—large sums can be obtained.

[Gasparyan] All the same, in Astrakhan, for example, people are becoming crippled and there are no legal guarantees.

[Vorontsov] It is quite clear that legal mechanisms must be established. But in addition to everything else that has been said, these mechanisms should be based on entirely different economic considerations as well. It would be interesting to find out whether or not the collective of the Astrakhan Gas Condensate Plant would shift to an economic accountability system. That is the first question. If they adopt such a system, then the collective will immediately face the problem of financing the health costs of their workers and health costs proceeding from injury to the local population. A whole other set of economic problems is introduced all of which will lead, in the final analysis, to increased costs, distressing as this may be to mention. But at the same time this should lead to a real increase in wages. We are going to have to be able to shift to a completely different kind of economics. For example, the state is currently allocating R3 billion each year for air purification. But what do we mean when we say "the state" is allocating? We mean you and I, all of us together. As we understand things today, a taxpayer is a person who pays income tax. In fact, however, each of us receives not nearly as much as he earns. Our earnings go to ourselves, to our pensions, to doctors and free education, to environmental protection measures, etc. And were we to take all of this into account, it might turn out that we start making stricter demands within each of these areas.

[Gasparyan] Well, for the time being ecologists have taken up defensive positions in dealing with departmental structures... Perhaps now is the time to effect transition to the attack? What should be the first step?

[Vorontsov] I have already addressed the fact that our schools have been teaching antibiology for decades. And so, many people are ecologically ignorant—not just the authorities, but subordinates as well. Not just technocrats, but those who are fighting for nature. We must remember that there may be some things that are not worth fighting for.

The Rzhevskoye Reservoir has been planned and designed for the Upper Volga. The Gidroproyekt Institute did the planning. Why? Because it became apparent that in such and such a year Moscow would not have enough drinking water. Academician A.L. Yakshin, USSR people's deputy, created a special commission to examine the feasibility of this project, following which it became clear that due to Moscow's water tanks and poor faucets, more water would flow out than the reservoir

could supply. Public opinion also played a great role here. In short, the sum total of these considerations forced the project to be shelved. But did it follow from this that some other department begin urgent work to replace Moscow's faucets and water tanks? No. Because the Gidroproyekt Institute has no interest in sanitation or hygiene equipment. It and its corresponding ministry are interested in designing hydropower stations, reservoirs, etc. If they cannot do it here—fine. They will do it somewhere else.

This is a typical example of a narrow departmental approach. In other words, the problem of providing water for Moscow was not being resolved—it was rather the problem of providing water by constructing a reservoir, not by conserving water.

We may also consider the controversy surrounding the Northern Heat and Electric Power Plant near Moscow. I have not been there and am not prepared to come out for or against. But before one discusses the project he must examine the ecological capacity of this region of Moscow. One must know what is nearby, what the wind pattern is like, what types of waste and discharge there will be, etc. In addition, each inhabitant of the region should know what he will be denied if this power plant is not constructed, how many kilowatts of energy he now has, how many he would have, etc. These are the kinds of questions which should be presented for the people's consideration.

It should be stated that the ecological movement has completely vindicated itself. But ecological extremism also exists which is founded simply on a lack of understanding. This is also a fact.

[Gasparyan] Yes, but this lack of understanding did not come out of nowhere. The absence of information played a definite role here. To this day we still do not have even the simplest ecological reference manuals. Incidentally, other countries have long had the practice of including in the packaging of a product all information relative to its chemical content and where it originated, right up to the address of the plant where it was produced.

[Vorontsov] It is too bad that we do not have that. Although we do have a product on which everything is recorded—mineral water. And this is not the only such product. Dairy products also indicate somewhere the amount of protein, fat, carbohydrates, and calories. But there is too little of this information. I see this as a lack of respect for one's own health. We do not have those "crazy" health cults you see, for example, in the United States. It absolutely amazed me to see what Americans eat. With a wide assortment available, they drink 0.5 percent-fat milk. I remember when the Americans came to us on their first expedition in 1971 and we traveled together to the Altay region. I was thinking about how I would obtain butter for them. Then we found out that Americans do not eat butter—it contains too much cholesterol, so they eat margarine.

We are currently having problems with uninterrupted sugar supply. But we require tremendous amounts of sugar. We also have the problem of extremely low per-capita vegetable production. We completely forget about producing low-caloric food products. It seems to me this is a frightful legacy of the past—the psychology of the hunger experienced during the civil war, the hunger of collectivization, the hunger of the Great Patriotic War. This is felt very strongly by my generation, and especially by the older generation. To this day there is the idea that you go on vacation, you recover—everything is okay.

In many Western countries, Spain for example, drinking water and water for preparing food is sold in special containers. Water from the tap is used for washing and sanitary needs. This is because there is a complete degree of openness with regard to polluting agents. The right of the individual to information in general is one of the most important rights of civilized people.

[Gasparyan] All the same, it is difficult for me to understand people who live within 30 kilometers of Chernobyl. What is this? Is it ecological ignorance? Today the population has received adequate information on the consequences of the catastrophe.

[Vorontsov] It is not ignorance. There is the concept of "imprinting," the impressing of an image. Each individual has an imprint of the place where he was born, the places where he has lived a long time. People who were born there or lived their whole lives there refuse to resettle. You have to keep in mind the scale of this tragedy, which we are only now beginning to understand following the declassification of data on the radioactive fallout. This has come quite late, it must be admitted. We learned today that one-fourth of the territory of Belorussia has fallen into the zone of radioactivity. This is an exceedingly serious matter, fraught with consequences involving not only the health of today's generation, but genetic transmission consequences as well.

I strongly believe the individual should know everything. He should make the decisions himself. We must explain to inhabitants of the Chernobyl zone just what the danger to their lives consists of. It is clear that not every person will fall ill. It is purely a question of statistics. We should announce publicly that the accident has affected a certain portion of the population, that according to estimates a certain number, some percentage of the population will contract cancer of the thyroid gland and a certain percentage of these will die from it. This is a fact. But these are matters of probability. For an individual who lives outside the Chernobyl zone also has a chance of falling ill with thyroid cancer and again a certain percentage will die of the disease. A person should be openly aware of this. In other words, the openness should be not simply an openness of, let us say, "covering" the situation with a figure—we must explain just what the figure means. An individual should be able to choose. On the topic of nitrates and nitrites everyone says: "Ah! Nitrates and nitrites!" But how you measure

them nobody knows. Why they are dangerous nobody knows. But the experts know! Mutation-inducing substances are exuded from them within a metabolic cycle which can produce malignant growths. There is also genetic danger for subsequent generations.

[Gasparyan] Finally, Nikolay Nikolayevich, would you say a few words about the new duties you will assume as Goskompriroda chairman?

[Vorontsov] My first job will be to concentrate around Goskompriroda, and if possible within the committee itself, the scientific expertise of our country. This is my first very important task because collective wisdom is required for developing a strategy.

The next step will be to achieve complete ecological glasnost, although I foresee very many difficulties on this path. As of today we are not even using our own data.

We should also have contact with social movements—we need to establish a dialogue with official and unofficial nature-protection societies.

Then we must eliminate ecological illiteracy on a country-wide level and pursue a program of ecological education.

Finally, we should think about book publishing. Our country's old publishing house, the Moscow Society of Students of Nature Publishing House, founded in 1805, is closed. Today the prospect of reviving this publishing house is entirely feasible.

Public's Concerns Over Tatar AES Project Outlined

PM0610131489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 89 Second Edition p 6

[Correspondent N. Morozov report: "But What If There Is a Disaster?"]

[Text] Kazan—As PRAVDA has already reported, a protest march of representatives of the autonomous republic's public against the building of the Tatar nuclear power station lasted 3 days. The route taken by the marchers began at the walls of Kazan University, passed through Naberezhnyye Chelny, and ended at the power station construction site—in Kamskiye Polyany.

The fact is that the construction of the nuclear power station is taking place in the region of the confluence of the Kama and the Volga, among a constellation of industrial giants, in a zone of tectonic activity. Geological and ecological conditions in the region are totally unsuitable for a nuclear power station site. That is the conclusion reached by experts from the Central Scientific Research and Design Institute of Urban Planning and the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of the Geology of Nonmetalliferous Minerals, as well as scientists from the USSR Academy of Sciences and Kazan University. In their opinion the construction of the nuclear power station is taking place without regard for very important International Atomic Energy Agency normative documents.

Specialists who addressed the rallies spoke with great concern about the risk of radioactive contamination of the waters of the Kuybyshev reservoir. Even a small accident at the Tatar Nuclear Power Station will result in tragedy for the entire Middle and Upper Volga. The inhabitants of Chistopol, Ulyanovsk, Kuybyshev, Saratov, Volgograd, and Astrakhan would suffer, among others....

The voice of the public, calling on the leaders of the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation to heed the alarming scientific predictions, is actively supported by party organs and the government of the autonomous republic. Nonetheless the union ministry stubbornly adheres to its departmental positions.

Medvedev on Gdlyan Commission's Problems

PM0510120189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with R. Medvedev, chairman of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies commission for verification of the materials connected with the activity of the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigative group headed by T. Gdlyan, by special correspondent A. Stepovoy under the rubric "From Competent Sources": "Believing Only the Facts"; date, place not given; first three paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] On 26 September journalists and representatives of the public were invited for the first time to a session of the commission set up by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies to verify the materials connected with the activity of the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigative group headed by T. Gdlyan. At that session it had been planned to hear evidence from KGB Colonel A. Dukhanin, who was involved in the investigation of bribery cases in Uzbekistan. The hearing began, but it was soon halted. It quickly came to light that it was impossible to work in the room placed at the disposal of the congress commission, into which the commission members themselves hardly fit. By a majority of votes the commission adopted a decision to postpone the session for 1 week and to hold it in a room which would have the necessary conditions for normal work both for the commission members and for the journalists.

However, the chief event of this session was the lifting of the embargo, of a kind, on press and television coverage of the congress commission's work.

Taking advantage of a proffered opportunity, IZVESTIYA's correspondent interviewed Commission Chairman R. Medvedev.

[Stepovoy] Roy Aleksandrovich, in our newspaper 3 months ago you appealed to all the interested sides and the mass media to refrain from making public statements

on this topic. But suddenly one and then another newspaper and then TASS began disseminating information and interviews with Deputy General Prosecutor V. Kravtsev and members of your commission—USSR People's Deputies I. Sorokin, V. Yarin....

[Medvedev] ...But before and since there have been many other articles, including statements by Gdlyan himself, in certain oblast youth newspapers, and he has given interviews to Radio Liberty, Italy's LA REPUBBLICA, and Leningrad Television. Telman Khorenovich has delivered public addresses at several enterprises in the capital and taken part in an odd show in the Crimea, where he openly made assessments of our commission's work and his own activity. Despite the Prosecutor's Office conclusions, he is continuing to accuse many people of bribery, although frequently he has no proof of this. Disregarding our commission's recommendations, the Prosecutor's Office also replies frequently to the public through the press.

[Stepovoy] Yet, probably the biggest response and public indignation have been aroused by reports citing certain members of your commission on obstacles created by personnel of the USSR Prosecutor's Office and other high offices.

[Medvedev] Indeed, an interview in the newspaper ARGUMENTY I FAKTY with Sorokin, a member of our commission, did excite public emotions once again. We cannot dispense with the necessary explanation here. During the parliamentary vacation Comrade Sorokin was acting as duty member of the commission and certainly was not temporary, acting chairman. As a matter of fact, Sorokin had not participated in the commission's work almost from the very start (he had been seriously ill and then sat examinations in the higher militia school). So he was not fully au fait with its work. In actual fact, the Prosecutor's Office had given us a number of important documents before we broke up for the vacation. Three senior officials of the USSR Prosecutor's Office delivered reports to our commission. In addition, after my return from leave we also received a large number of documents from the Prosecutor's Office.

[Stepovoy] Does this mean that the commission now possesses all the necessary documents?

[Medvedev] No, not all. We have not been provided with documents of the following nature. First, Memorandums and information which the USSR Prosecutor's Office sent to the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on all cases. They told me, reasonably, that they had prepared those documents for the CPSU Central Committee, not for the congress commission, and they recommended applying to that address.

Second. The Prosecutor's Office has not given me or other commission members documents on so-called "live" cases—that is, cases which have not yet gone to court. By law all these cases are an investigatory secret and are not normally made public. So I do not consider it correct to claim that the Prosecutor's Office is totally disregarding the commission. It is correct to say that it is reluctant to provide cases—that is, you have to display a certain persistence every time... The CPSU Central Committee too did not provide all the documents at once—only after M.S. Gorbachev's intervention.

We have gotten most documents from the Supreme Court. Ye. Smolentsev, its chairman, told his colleagues in my presence: Absolutely all cases and documents are to be given to our commission members without any restrictions.

We have also received many documents from the KGB without any hindrance.

[Stepovoy] It is somehow hard to believe that, since T. Gdlyan has made many accusations against the KGB.

[Medvedev] Yes, that is so. But the first document files that our commission received were from the KGB. They are important documents. Of course, they do not give the complete picture, but precisely the KGB was the first to begin the so-called "Uzbek" case. The only party that has still not provided any documents, despite numerous appeals, requests, and demands, are Gdlyan, Ivanov, and the members of their group.

[Stepovoy] What arguments do you have to listen to here?

[Medvedev] Telman Khorenovich says that the documents are hidden in his own personal secret archives and that he will produce them when he deems it necessary. A flippant statement....

[Stepovoy] Enough time has elapsed since the end of the Congress. The attention of millions of people is riveted on your commission. Why is your investigation taking so long?

[Medvedev] The investigation has lasted 2 and ½ months. Whereas Gdlyan and Ivanov with a group of approximately 200 investigators took 3-4 years to prove that particular workers were or were not bribetakers, the commission must evaluate the whole package of these questions and review hundreds of volumes of criminal cases. Because Ivanov and Gdlyan are accusing, in addition, 18 present and former leading personnel of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Prosecutor's Office, and the Supreme Court.

[Stepovoy] What is the commission's work mechanism like, and how do you arrive at a consensus?

[Medvedev] We meet once a week to discuss questions. But the commission is bound to hear any statement or report. We heard Gdlyan and Ivanov first. Then General Prosecutor Sukharev; Karakozov and Popova, senior officials of the Prosecutor's Office; and Marov, former chairman of the Supreme Court Military Collegium. Today we began hearing Col Dukhanin of the KGB.

Although I am sometimes asked to hold a session every day, I do not think it is necessary to sit more than once

a week. We seek the truth not only in the sessions. Commission members study specific cases and speak as experts. For example, individual commission members have studied the Smirnov case, the case of Churbanov and others, and now the Khudayberdiyev case. Sorokin and several enlisted experts have begun studying the testimonies given or not given against high-ranking leaders.

[Stepovoy] Looking back, do you not think that it would not be a bad thing in such instances to make provision for a larger commission?

[Medvedev] The optimum size is 15-16 people. More are not needed. But it is necessary to set up expert groups under the commission.

[Stepovoy] Roy Aleksandrovich, your commission was formed by the Congress. But now people on all sides are demanding that you give an immediate answer. Do you intend to wait for the opening of the Congress, or will you nonetheless inform the public?

[Medvedev] We will inform the public on how the commission is working, who is hindering it, and who is honestly cooperating and helping. For this we have decided to invite journalists to our sessions. You will see more clearly what you are writing about.

[Stepovoy] The maximum objectivity is undoubtedly needed in such a complex matter. Our newspaper, for example, would like to continue to adhere to this position and to be a platform open for the expression of very diverse opinions—only based, of course, on facts, not on emotions. In granting this interview to IZVESTIYA, you must realize, of course, that there may be a reaction to it. Are you expecting that?

[Medvedev] Yes. That reaction is coming all the time. So far because we have been silent. But when we have started speaking, the reaction will be all the more stormy. That does not bother me. I am ready....

[Stepovoy] What thoughts and conclusions have occurred to you after familiarizing yourself with the events around Gdlyan's investigative group?

[Medvedev] We know that during Brezhnev's times our society was corrupt from bottom to top. I do not say that Uzbekistan was an exception or that the rule of Rashidov and Adylov did not take place. But there were honest people there too, who suffered above all.

Yes, there were many bribes in Uzbekistan—billions (not millions!) passed from hand to hand. Some of those billions were transferred to Moscow. If Brezhnev used to accept gifts worth tens and hundreds of thousands of rubles, which can quite well be considered bribes, if Shchelokov, Churbanov, Galina Brezhneva, and others used to accept these bribes, the people became convinced that the entire leading clique was behaving likewise. The fact that Kunayev, Grishin, Medunov, and Romanov calmly retired on personal pensions makes people mistrust the authorities. People believe that the upper echelons are corrupt. Therefore the people are displeased that Churbanov, for example, far from the most important person in that affair, was punished for taking bribes, while the others got away.

We still have some unwritten rule that people above a certain position must not be brought to investigation and trial. This was the case under Brezhnev. It is still the case now.

The people have become convinced that there were many bribetakers in the country's leadership, and so they believe Gdlyan and Ivanov. I understand that. People side with them because they see them as defenders of the people's interests.

But the commission must be guided in its conclusions not by feelings, however noble they may be, but above all by the facts, and by them alone.

Interior Ministry Briefing on Crime Rates

LD0410051189 Moscow TASS in English 1600 GMT 3 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS—During the first half of 1989, foreign nationals committed 194 crimes in the Soviet Union, mostly acts of hooliganism committed in a drunken state, reporters were told at a news briefing at the Soviet Interior Ministry today.

The gravest crime involving foreigners is smuggling antiques, above all, icons.

Soviet customs officials recently confiscated works of art, worth 134,000 roubles, from two Finns when they were trying to take them illegally out of the Soviet Union.

Last year, a Soviet customs house confiscated about one ton of caviar, worth some 350,000 dollars on the world market, from foreigners.

At the same time, reporters were told, more than 2,000 crimes were committed against foreigners in this country between January and July this year. Eighty five per cent of them were property crimes.

Most of these violations included the buying of foreign currency and clothes from foreigners. About 60 per cent of the crimes, such as thefts, robberies and swindling, were committed when the deals were being transacted.

Foreigners often provoke crimes against themselves by entering into illegal deals with peddlers, foreign currency speculators and prostitutes.

The Interior Ministry took steps to prevent illegal actions involving foreigners in the Soviet Union. The main criminal investigation department set up a special section to combat such crimes.

Similar sections or groups have been established in the capitals of constituent republics, health resorts and port cities of the country.

In addition, militia forces are being reinforced at international airports and hotels.

These steps have helped somewhat to stabilise the situation, reporters were told. Four organised groups of criminals, who had committed 37 robberies involving foreigners, have been disbanded in Moscow and the nearby region over the past two months alone.

In Belorussia, 25 groups of speculators in foreign currency and foreign-made goods were exposed this year. The militia confiscated from them precious metals, worth more than 100,000 roubles, and large amounts of foreign currency.

MVD Internal Troops Chief Interviewed

PM0610145589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[Article by Lieutenant Colonels A. Semenyaka and A. Deryabin under the rubric "Portrait in the Light of Glasnost": "Colonel General Yu. Shatalin: 'We Have Come to Protect You'"]

[Excerpts] ...Only the bridge separated hundreds of armed people. Only the bridge over the Galidzgu River. The situation in Abkhaziya's Ochamchirskiy Rayon had gotten out of control: Neither appeals for reason from the local authorities nor the reinforced militia detachments were able any longer to calm things down. And then somebody approached the bridge... in all his general's regalia... unarmed... holding only a bullhorn.

"I'm General Shatalin. Cease fire! We ask everyone to withdraw, we have come to protect you and prevent bloodshed.'

The shooting stopped.

...Fergana. It was impossible to get through to the doors of the oblast party committee, which was blockaded by a huge mob of women and old people. Meskhetian Turks had brought a mutilated corpse right into the city center. "Who's protecting us?" the mob howled. "That's why we're here," the man in the general's uniform said. "What do you mean, 'we'? It's all lies, everyone's scared of the bandits!" And they forced the general to bend over the body: Just look what they're doing to us. He then got out his papers and showed them to people. The words "Shatalin... From Moscow..." ran through the crowd. And it parted. [passage omitted]

We found the chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] Internal Troops poring over a map of the USSR. He called us over to the table:

"Look, a military food convoy of five trucks and three armored personnel carriers is heading for a population center in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. At a crossing the convoy's way was blocked by a locomotive. It has made a detour. A few kilometers ahead the trucks will be met by an excitable mob of up to 1,500 people. I have to make a decision..." [passage omitted]

"All of us," Yuriy Vasilyevich said, "still have to look into the causes behind the outbreaks of audacious crimes recently. Criminals are getting impudent. There have been increased cases of hostage-taking, not least in jails and corrective labor institutions. The terrorists' victims, as a rule, are female service personnel—those who are least able to defend themselves. Under these circumstances we have been forced to set up a network of highly skilled mobile special-purpose subunits. We attach very great importance to their training. For instance, more hostages were taken in the first 8 months of this year than in the past 10 years. But not one of the kidnappings achieved the aims set by the criminals. Cooperating closely with MVD and KGB organs, our specialists have demonstrated courage, fearlessness, and a readiness to risk their lives for a just cause. I would go further: Foreign services and specialists from the socialist countries, the FRG, and Austria have taken an interest in our experience of combating terrorists. These specialists have been guests at our training centers and have seen how we train. It is gratifying that our views coincide on the questions of the fight against crime."

And now life is introducing a new element for the internal troops and their chief—mass interethnic riots have been flaring up.

"No, I cannot say that I—or my troops, incidentally—was psychologically prepared for the exacerbation of manifestations of hostility between the representatives of different nationalities in the country. I had not previously given any thought to the matter. But we are all thinking about it so much nowadays! I thought I knew life and people, I thought the traditions of hospitality and respect so widespread in Central Asia were unshakable. I had experience in Afghanistan behind me too. Then suddenly there were smoking ruins in Fergana and brutes in Abkhaziya. How could this bloody chain be broken? For the moment the internal troops are the only realistic defense against extremist intrigue. But is it for us alone to put out the fire of national enmity and counter crime? Finding a way out of the situation that has emerged is a job for the politicians and for local soviet and party organs. Our job is to act within the law and within common human humanitarian principles. Acting means taking steps, it means being where your presence is needed, it means going personally to where a mob high on nationalism is baying for blood for the sake of 'justice,' for revenge for the sake of 'justice'—in other words, blood again....

"What can I say," Yuriy Vasilyevich pondered, "our people have recently read a lot and heard a lot of negative things about the internal troops. It seems that we are sadists and murderers. No mother or father will accept explanations about the objective circumstances

surrounding the death of their son or daughter. They blame us soldiers, and us alone, for their death. But does the general public know the names of those shadowy politicians and public figures who brought the masses out onto the squares, who whipped up the crowds to fever pitch with anti-Soviet slogans, and who are now doing everything possible and impossible with the single aim of accusing the troops, while keeping their 'hands clean' themselves? And it is becoming clear to all sober-minded people that force must be used against violence, be it prompted by nationalism or criminal motives. Real force when the vandalism is taking place, and subsequently, of course, the force of reason, compromise, and political solutions to any differences that have arisen. It is no secret to anyone today that the presence of troops in the NKAO is the only factor stabilizing the situation in the region. But will our officers, warrant officers, and young soldiers have to pay very much longer with great physical and moral pressure, with their health, and with their lives for the inactivity, connivance, and national blindness of the local leadership?"

We noticed a business card on Col Gen Yu. Shatalin's table: Bill Keller, American journalist. This piece of cardboard was a kind of starting point in changing the military chief's relations with the media. "We internal troops are also growing together with our glasnost and the democratization of society," Yuriy Vasilyevich said. "Starting with the events in Fergana, we have hidden nothing. Our press centers have given the fullest information on dead and wounded, on the numbers of weapons seized, and so forth. I have repeatedly heard local leaders make complaints such as 'You say too much.' But life teaches that there is no such thing as a lot of truth. Things are either true or they're not. We will go further down the road of glasnost in our work. For the sake of the well-being of each honest Soviet person and for the sake of law and order, over which we stand guard."

RSFSR Red Cross Opens Moscow Soup Kitchen

PM1310131989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Yu. Zapadalov, chief of department at the Red Cross Society Central Committee: "They Will Be Given Food and Warmth"]

[Text] Several dozen people call every day at the reception room of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Red Cross Society Central Committee with the most diverse requests. They most frequently concern material assistance for people disabled since childhood, war and labor invalids, and large families. Recently there has been an increase in the number of persons who have served sentences in places of imprisonment and have failed to settle in their place of permanent residence or are without work, and consequently often lack means of livelihood through no fault of their own.

Over the last few years the Red Cross has offered them only material assistance. But a charity cafeteria opened this October at No 11 Pushkin Street with assistance from Frunzenskiy Trust of Moscow Cafeterias. Henceforth, all who need it will be given food and warmth free of charge on recommendation from the society's Central Committee. All the catering and service costs will be borne by the RSFSR Red Cross Society Central Committee.

New Business Paper Published in USSR

LD0810163689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1015 GMT on 8 October broadcasts a 2-minute interview with G. Pavlovskiy, co-director of the Postfaktum Agency set up by the Alliance of United Cooperatives of the USSR, which has begun publishing a newspaper entitled KOMMERSANT." Pavlovskiy points out that it's aim is to help reestablish independent commercial and entrepreneurial activity in the USSR. The paper will appear weekly and its 16-20 pages will be split into two sections, the first covering current business events and the second analyzing general trends and problems.

Military

Akhromeyev Discussses Military Issues

LD1110031289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Oct 89

["Topical Interview" featuring Marshal Sergey Federovich Akhromeyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee, Aleksey Kireyev, candidate of economic sciences, and hosts Dmitriy Zakharov and Aleksandr Lyubimov; "What Kind of Army Do We Need?"—from a special edition of the "View" program; live or recorded in studio]

[Text] [Zakharov] Sergey Fedorovich, as far as I know you pay particular attention to the issue of the military threat. Tell us, how real is the military threat to our country today; does it exist?

[Akhromeyev] I think it does. The military threat remains. Why? The main reason is the policy being pursued by the United States and its partners in the North Atlantic alliance, mainly Great Britain, the FRG, and France, toward the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. The policy is a policy of strength. Incidentally, the leaders openly talk about that too. Quite recently President Bush said that the secret of our success will be appraised in one word: Strength. Let us preserve the military might which has helped to change the situation throughout the world. I could cite such pronouncements for you by President Bush, the defense secretary, and Secretary of State Baker. Not just one, but very many. But these are pronouncements. At the same time, if one is to speak purely of politics in the broadest sense, then

those same leaders talk about major positive changes, but when the subject of conversation is military and political situations, military policy, then strength is immediately brought to the fore. But, you see, there are deeds backing up those words. At present the armed forces of the North Atlantic alliance, if one is to take all 15 states together, comprises 6.4 million people. If one takes Europe, in Europe the North Atlantic alliance keeps a powerful force—3.6 million people. What are they being kept there for?

Then, you see, we should take into account the territorial claims made on the Soviet Union. You know that such claims are being made by Japan. You see, the U.S. President says that he wants the Soviet Union to return the northern territories to Japan. On what basis? That issue was decided in 1945 by the results of the Second World War and the San Francisco Treaty, by the peace treaty between the United States and Japan. It is probably no secret that the United States does not recognize that our Baltic republics, Soviet socialist republics, are part of the Soviet Union.

[Zakharov] But it is hardly likely that anyone will resolve that question now by military strength.

[Akromeyev] By military strength, no, but only in the event of our possessing the commensurate forces. If we do not have them, then there will be those who wish to resolve that by force.

[Zakharov] That means it will inevitably lead to a nuclear war?

[Akhromeyev] Not necessarily nuclear war; why should it be? Any situation can arise. Finally, after all, talks are being held on practically all types of armaments. Talks are being held on strategic nuclear weapons, on armed forces in Europe, on elimination of chemical weapons, and I could extend the list for you. But the United States categorically refuses to hold talks on reducing naval forces. Even now the United States has a navy considerably superior to ours in combat might. But it refuses to hold talks on reducing naval forces. All these very serious reasons force us to have armed forces at the appropriate level. Consider that we are reducing our Armed forces unilaterally, while the United States and the NATO bloc categorically refuse to reduce them, claiming that we possess some kind of military superiority. This is a myth that has been maintained for decades, while neither the Soviet Union nor the Warsaw Pact possesses such a superiority.

[Zakharov] So, why do we carry out reductions, then? Are we thus damaging our defense potential?

[Akhromeyev] You see what a conclusion you immediately draw! [laughs] Of course, we are reducing, but we are reducing because, as I have already said, since the military threat has diminished, the threat of war has diminished, someone has to make a start. It is objective. If we do not start, the arms race will continue interminably. Therefore we are taking such an initiative. But we look at it soberly and we say, yes, by 500,000 men, it is possible. There can be no further reductions on a unilateral basis. It must continue with bilateral reduction of both military alliances.

[Lyubimov] Aleksey Kireyev, what is your point of view on this question?

[Kireyev] Yes, I have my own opinion on this question. As far as I know, currently in Soviet science, opinion is divided concerning sources of military threat. One of the opinions consists in the fact that a source of military threat is the presence of certain forces and facilities of the United States and its NATO allies. Since they have these facilities, they certainly wish to put them in action, at some point in time, for both the strategic nuclear forces and many other facilities for waging war are not being built up for nothing. But there exists another point of view, according to which the military threats, the causes of the military threat may be, rather, unsanctioned conflicts, conflicts not planned beforehand. In brief, chance.

[Akhromeyev] What you say about the causes of, say, world war, or a major clash, could be some kind of sudden conflict: This is not ruled out completely, because history proves this, and today this is possible. But all the same, if we are to speak not of war but of policy, indeed it is by policy that state interests are protected. You said that now one can somehow not have forces but still defend one's interests. Now, the basis of our foreign policy is precisely to conduct it not from a position of force, but to conduct it from a position of equality of all states. We say that we now have three fundamentals: demilitarization, democratization, and de-ideologization. On this basis, excuse me, we are building our policy, but when they behave toward us from a position of force, then we willy-nilly must have something to respond with.

[Zakharov] As I understand it, the Americans conduct a policy of deterrence toward us, and we conduct a policy of deterrence toward them. Consequently each side is conducting policy from a position of strength with regard to the other, and as long as armies exist it will probably not be otherwise.

[Akhromeyev] Your arguments are logical, and I agree with them, but one must consider who is the initiator of demilitarization.

[Zakharov] We are.

[Akhromeyev] We are. We are unilaterally reducing the Armed Forces; we put forward positive proposals at the negotiations, and generally, for the normalization of the situation in the world. Unfortunately, our partners far from always meet us halfway.

[Kireyev] If an American businessman has interests in Western Europe, he probably has no interest in any war breaking out in Western Europe. American business, large monopolist trasnational business, has created a

so-called second economy in Western Europe which we are already comparing in scale to the U.S. economy. This would mean the loss of all its assets. I find it difficult to suppose that very big business, which has an immense and very strong lobby, and which has great power for putting pressure on the U.S. Congress, will allow the President or Congress to make any decision which runs contrary to its own intersts. That is the Western side. The side of the Soviet Union and our Warsaw Pact allies: To a certain extent this process of militarization of ours; well, perhaps this word does not apply to us very well, but in any case the attempts to make an adequate response to the actions of the United States and NATO have brought us to an economic impasse to a certain extent. We have become choked by military expenditure. We have immense expenditure on the maintenance of the Armed Forces, and this is now simply an unsupportable burden, for our economy. Nine percent of gross national product is an amount which no developed capitalist country has; it is about the same as what is spent on military purposes by such countries as Qatar, Oman, Saudi Arabia, and other fairly heavily militarized states. At the same time, the United States is spending 6 percent, Japan, as we know, spends 3 percent of its gross national product, sorry 1 percent; the majority of West European countries spend 3 or 4 percent.

[Lyubimov] But they have a bigger gross national product. Perhaps this proportion is necessary, to spend more in order to maintain this parity. Perhaps it is an enforced measure.

[Akhromeyev] I think that we must correct our dialogue. After all, I am not saying that the United States wants to unleash a war, or a conflict, now. I do not even believe this, and this is my personal opinion, but when I was in the United States I said openly that I do not believe that the United States wants to unleash a war now. The point is not war; it is politics and pressure; it is that by using military, economic, and ideological means, they want to exert pressure on us. Military force still plays an enormous role in that pressure. That is the angle from which it is now necessary to approach this policy, although, I have already said, together with you, that a great deal has been intertwined here.

You are right that we have no need of such military expenditure, either, and in fact nor have other countries, including the United States. So the issue is one of reducing them. The question now is how. There can be unilateral initiatives; we have had them more than once, but these are specific details. But if one is speaking of a radical reduction in military expenditure, then this must be a bilateral process. Only then will we arrive at a reduction of military tension, at greater confidence, and at a point where this burden is lifted from the economies of the two alliances.

[Zakharov] What kind of armed forces do we need in order to restrain the existing danger of war at its present level?

[Akhromeyev] In principle, when military men and politicians talk about what kind of armed forces are needed, both are concerned about the correlation of forces. Well then, if you now compare the military forces of these two alliances, then I have, I think, already said that NATO's armed forces as a whole now number 6.5 million [as heard]. And due simply to lack of time, I will not now cite all these other figures pertaining to the quantities of arms.

So, we in the Warsaw Pact now have in the range of 5.3 million. In Europe, where the sides have most powerful forces confronting each other, each side has, on average, about 3.6 million. Well—we do not wish to have such armed forces, but, well, the situation that took shape in the mid-eighties, I mean, incidentally, not without our share of the blame, either—this is also an issue in which everyone has had a hand, NATO and the Warsaw Pact alike; we reached such enormous figures of numerical strength of personnel and arms—well, the question now is that they must be reduced and I think that the Soviet Union is now doing all it can to do so, but, unfortunately, it does not always encounter an appropriate response from the other side, so that this process could move faster.

[Kireyev] A decision has been made to cut the Soviet Armed Forces by half a million. As far as the postwar period is concerned, this is not the first reduction in the Soviet Army. Who made this decision? It has been endorsed and, so to speak, enshrined in a relevant decision of what at that time was still the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It was announced for the first time by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. This figure was debated somewhere. The people's deputies were aware of this figure. Why is it precisely 500,000—and not 1 million or 800,000 or 300,000? When was this figure arrived at—where does it come from?

[Akhromeyev] Incidentally, the people's deputies could not at that time know it simply because they did not exist then.

[Kireyev] Well, yes, but the Supreme Soviet ones....

[Akhromeyev] OK, but not the people's deputies, the Supreme Soviet deputies did.

[Kireyev] Yes, the Supreme Soviet deputies did.

[Akhromeyev] Well, I must tell you that by the middle of 1988 our state's political and military leadership arrived at a unanimous view that the situation was becoming less tense; that a military and political situation had taken shape in which the Soviet Union could unilaterally reduce its Armed Forces. The political leadership naturally consulted our allies on this issue and our allies arrived at the same conclusion. Then we received instructions from Comrade Gorbachev to work this through. When I say we, I speak of the military leadership—at that time I was chief of the General Staff. To work this through: By how much can we reduce the Armed Forces and over what period of time, and this

goes both for the numerical strength of the Armed Forces and for military expenditure. And, well, during the second half of 1988 this process of working it through was underway. At the Defense Council we made many reports—but suggestions were made again to us, the military men, to work a bit more, to make things more precise, because it is a very complex matter. At long last, the political and military leadership arrived together, collectively, at this precise figure—that in this case, the Armed Forces could, by the end of 1988, be reduced by 500,000 men.

[Zakharov] Should the structure of our Armed Forces be undergoing alterations within the context of the political transformations taking place?

[Akhromeyev] Well, as is known, our Armed Forces currently comprise five services. Let me briefly recall—because it may well be that not all our listeners and viewers are aware of the fact that we have Strategic Missile Forces, Ground Forces, the Air Force, the Air Defense Forces and the Navy, while most countries have three services: ground forces, air force, and navy. I think it is completely justified that we in the Soviet Union have a separate service within the Armed Forces—the Air Defense Forces. Comrades, our state's territory amounts to 21.3 million square kilometers. Our land frontiers are 40,000 km long; our sea frontier is 60,000 km. We are surrounded—on all sides, unfortunately. When I spoke of the military threat I did not say this. The Soviet Union is surrounded on all sides by the military bases of the United States of America, beginning with Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, Japan, the Philippines, the Indian Ocean, through Israel and the Mediterranean to Europe and Norway—everywhere there are bases. Over 500,000 men are deployed on these bases, along with thousands of aircraft and several navies. This represents a real military threat to the Soviet Union. We are compelled to maintain the country's Air Defense Forces—they are precisely an independent arm of the Armed Forces in view of the Soviet Union's specific physical-geographical, or as it is now referred to, geostrategic position.

The Strategic Missile Forces had taken shape historically—their coming into being belongs to the end of the fifties. A decision was made at that time to have such an arm of the Armed Forces. They are now deployed—after all, these are the troops which are on permanent combat readiness. Their combat readiness is measured in seconds.

Control and guidance systems took decades to set up. Many billions of rubles were invested in this. To change the structure now, at present, is in my view—and, after all, I have served in the Armed Forces for 50 years and in the General Staff for 15 years and, well, I feel I am a professional in these matters and am able soberly to appraise things—to change the structure now is, in my view, inexpedient.

If, however, we manage to reach agreement at the talks—and I believe in this—and to reduce the sides' strategic offensive arms by 50 percent, then I think the time will then come—and, moreover, if we manage to reach agreement on large reductions of the armed forces in Europe, the time will come when we shall have to think radically about what the armed forces' structure should be like, with the aim of cutting the costs of the apparatus in charge and many other issues. Incidentally, the Ministry of Defense is currently dealing with these issues, as far as I know.

[Lyubimov] Sergey Fedorovich, from this viewpoint, if the nuclear component of our Armed Forces is reduced, do you regard our Armed Forces' defense capability as sufficient to defend the country?

[Akhromeyev] You are surely aware that on 15 January 1986 a program of eliminating nuclear weapons in our country, the Soviet Union, and in the world as a whole was adopted.

[Zakharov] By the year 2000.

[Akhromeyev] By the year 2000, yes, perfectly correct, by the year 2000. And this is our position.

[Zakharov] How realistic is it?

[Akhromeyev] Well, you see, I mean I think that it is a realistic program. No one thought we would succeed in reducing a whole arm of service [rod voysk], the medium-range missiles and the short-range missiles. But, after all, the treaty is signed and we are destroying them, we and the Americans. I think that it is possible—in any case I do not rule out that over the next few years it will be possible to reach agreement on eliminating entire arms of nuclear forces [rody yadernykh sil]. So I think it is realistic.

[Lyubimov] Here is a question for both our guests. There is a view that if a relative analysis of our Armed Forces in 1941 and now is carried out, it transpires that at that time we had a multiple superiority, let us say in particular tanks, over our future enemy, Hitlerite Germany, and, nonetheless, we had to retreat, and now our Armed Forces are incapable—if the nuclear component is removed—of safeguarding the defense capability.

[Akhromeyev] How do you mean incapable, I fail to understand, whose concoction....

[Lyubimov, interrupting] There is such a view among scientists.

[Akhromeyev] Oh? Well, I mean, to begin with I am never in favor of such sweeping statements. And in 1941 there was no such multiple superiority in tanks.

[Lyubimov] Four-fold or so?

[Akhromeyev] No, no, comrades. These issues must be studied seriously. We had 1,870 modern tanks. These were the T-34 and the KV tanks. The remaining tanks

were obsolete—an enormous pool of tanks in disrepair, due to a number of causes. If you just take the quantity then you are right—we had about 1.9 times more—but you must not oversimplify it like that; you must have a fundamental understanding of this matter.

[Kireyev] It sems to me that ideas and concepts of this nature made their appearance due to the emergence of a lack of trust among the people that the Armed Forces can defend us in case there is some kind of cataclysm in international relations. Indeed, Rust's landing on Red Square, sunken submarines, ships on fire, a pilotless fighter flying in an unknown direction are—well, maybe these are isolated facts, I want to believe this very much indeed, but in itself these undermine both the prestige of the Armed Forces and trust in the Armed Forces. You know, not so long ago a research paper was published in the West, contrasting the level of proficiency [vyuchka] of Soviet soldiers and officers with the proficiency of professional armies, in the United States, for instance. The following data were arrived at: Soviet pilots' proficiency is twice as bad as that of the Americans, since they have considerably less flight training time.

[Akhromeyev] Excuse me, why should they have less flight training time? What does this depend upon?

[Kireyev] Well, the amount of training is another question undoubtedly. The amount of training of Soviet tank crews is ten times less than that of the Americans.

[Akhromeyev] That is fantasy.

[Kireyev] That may well be. Incidentally, that is just what I want to learn about—your viewpoint on this subject. Is this not due to the fact that ours is a call-up army and not a professional army? May be we should make it a profession—the defense of the motherland?

[Akhromeyev] I think that, as far as we are concerned, this question is being artificially fanned up. This is because it is now perfectly clear that the Soviet Union should have and can have only an army based upon a universal military service obligation. Why? There are two main reasons here, although others can be found, too. The first is the geo-strategic situation in which the Soviet Union lives. In the West, on the territory of Western Europe, there are the armed forces of the NATO bloc. And I told you there are 3.6 million of them. These are crack armies, well equipped and well trained. In the East you also have the United States. The Pacific Ocean—the U.S. Armed Forces are in the Pacific Ocean, along with the Armed Forces of Japan and its ally, the Armed Forces of South Korea.

This—I mean we must reckon with this. In such conditions we must have such armed forces in peacetime as would ensure for us the defense capability but would not represent an inordinate burden for the country. This means we must have a certain number of armed forces—personnel and military hardware—while the remainder must be in readiness; this is the so-called mobilization readiness.

Under normal conditions, in peacetime, the numerical strength of the Army amounts to about 25-27 percent of its numerical strength in wartime. So, if you have an army based upon a universal military service obligation, then, in our country, trained people are systematically discharged into the reserves and subsequently, through holding special training sessions, we keep them on the appropriate level. If you have a professional army you have no such mobilization readiness. This is because the soldier serves for 10 to 15 years, and there is no such training of reservists in such conditions. You ask: How do other armies live? Well, in esence we have two professional armies. These are the U.S. Army and the Army of Great Britain. The United States lives on the other side of the ocean and it has two such dangerous adversaries on its borders as Mexico and Canada. [laughter] That is why they can live the way they do. Great Britain, one way or another, lives on the other side of the English Channel and it has Western Europe for cover. But countries such as the FRG, France, Spain, and Italy have armies based upon universal military service obligation and this is most certanly not a coincidence. This is also because of the fact that they wish to have reserves. This is one reason. But I must tell you about the second reason, too. The second reason is economic. Well, after all, if you have a volunteer army this means that the soldiers ought to live in apartments. This means we have a duty of making sure that he has his wages—let us say about R300—we have a duty to make sure he has an apartment. I mean where—well, if, roughly speaking we were to pay servicemen R300 each, we would need between R12 and R16 billion over and above the budget. We would need to have 1.5 million apartments built.

[Lyubimov] That is unrealistic, of course.

[Akhromeyev] Who can do this now? Why has this question arisen? Someone is artificially fanning it up.

[Lyubimov] Well, this is by way of a discussion of this problem.

[Akhromeyev] No, excuse me—I mean, as a professional, I have cause to encounter this. Maybe to you it is a discussion—but this influences the combat readiness, people's mood, it has an effect of people having doubts—is this the army that is needed or not, scapegoats are then found—for us it is a serious question.

[Lyubimov] Aleksey, what is your view?

[Kireyev] I will comment on the second part of your answer with regard to the economic burden. As ever, we certainly do not know the Soviet figures on this score. Moreover, it is very difficult even to say what number of soldiers we must provide for if suddenly, as it were, we want to have a professional army.

[Akhromeyev] But why, excuse me. It is very simple. After the reductions by the first of January 1990, we will have an army of 3.7 million men.

[Kireyev] Yes, 760,000.

[Akhromeyev] Yes, 3,760,000 men. From this take away about 1.2 million.

[Kireyev] Ah, it is necessary to know this figure.

[Akhromeyev] Why then, you take away officers, warrant-officers and regular soldiers. Two and a half million men remain. Multiply two and half by R300. Even though many must be paid considerably more. In the north, in the Navy. Well, this is an example so you will obtain a figure. After this build them one and a half million flats, build them clubs, kindergartens, schools. Who will do the building?

[Kireyev] Sergey Fedorovich. I here, for some reason it seems to me that this position, which among others is expressed in announcements by spokesmen for the Ministry of Defense, is slightly linked to the fact that, in my opinion, there exists the desire not to tackle social problems in the Army. They question "Who will build apartments? It is very expensive" You know I have here a slightly different reasoning. Yes, large amounts of money indeed have to be paid, it is necessary to build apartments. But if we reduce the Armed Forces, then expenditure on such items as weapons procurement, military-scientific research and experimental design work, scientific research, and military construction is reduced and the economies made will be quite large. Further....

[Akhromeyev, interrupting] Excuse me, but we, after all, agreed that this process of reduction of armed forces is a bilateral process. It does not depend only on me and you.

[Kireyev] Yes, undoubtedly. I am talking about our unilateral reductions.

[Akhromeyev] But if this is resolved and we radically cut the Armed Forces, then the principle of remanning may change.

[Kiryev] Sergey Fedorovich, we are reducing military production by 20 percent, we are cutting the military budget by 14 percent and we are cutting perosnnel by 19 percent. We are doing this on a unilateral basis. This means that certain expenditures on the given items must be reduced in the framework of the military budget. I understand that the present time is such that it is necessary to economize on everything, and certainly instead of R77 billion, we will probably have to spend on military needs, as has just been proposed at the session, R71 billion. Nevertheless, where can the economies, about which I have been talking, be made? It seems to me that on the whole they will be indirect. That is, it will not be necessary to maintain a huge mobilization system. That system of military commissariats which already exists seems to me already obsolete. In those places where many people with shoulder boards, who get quite large salaries, work, civilians can, to a certain extent, cope. It will not be necessary to divert people from, say, work to various kinds of training, further training, and so on. That is, the Army here practically uses the unpaid labor of Soviet people, labor which is paid for by other departments and ministries. As a matter of fact, the military budget must be increased by that sum. But at the same time, by the way, it is necessary to proceed from the basis that servicemen must be occupied only in their direct duties, and not harvest potatoes in the fields, you understand, and not build, maybe, roads in the countryside. Servicemen must ensure our country's defense capability. It seems to me, you know, there are historical experiences after all, there is the U.S. experience. The United States, when switching to a professional army, expenditure on its constant costs, not its fluctuating costs where inflation is taken into account, but its constant costs, not only did not increase, but decreased from $79 billion in 1968 to $72 billion in 1988. In my opinion, this experience deserves attention.

[Akhromeyev] In which year?

[Kireyev] In 1988, on the maintainance of personnel I have in mind.

[Akhromeyev] In 1988 it was 305 billion.

[Kireyev] No, only on the maintainance of personnel. I do not have in mind all expenditure on procurement, only the personnel. This was reduced.

[Akhromeyev] I must say that the Armed Forces not only pick potatoes—I do not see anything bad in this, no more than in the fact that each of our military units has a subsidiary plot where pigs and sometimes cows are raised, and the Armed Forces provide themselves with meat for 3 months and with potatoes and everything else for 4 months. This is handy in the conditions of our state. When one says that it is something the Armed Forces are not entitled to do I think that, you see, one needs military experience in addition to knowledge, one has to serve and to see how troops live. There is the concept of rear services and this is an absolutely normal concept; but it is another matter when you say that this is not the main thing; but the Armed Forces are providing everything for themselves, because nobody builds anything for the Armed Forces, they build their own bases and quarters. Each year the Armed Forces commission 4.3 million square meters of housing area and 86,000 apartments. But the problem is that each year they lose 70,000 apartments. As a rule, after retiring an officer tries to stay in the same place—maybe with the exception of the Far East and the North—but when our people are discharged from service, apartments are lost, too.

[Lyubimov] But this is a contribution to the overall economy and the increase of well-being.

[Akhromeyev] Do you think I resent this fact? These are our people, our officers, but as a result, we permanently have 155-160,000 people without apartments. We were given a number of apartments—about 14,000—at the expense of the local soviets. But now we are going over to self-financing and this year, 1990, appears to be the last one when apartments will be given. But I know that everything possible is being done—now the Ministry of

Defense is doing this—but the Ministry of Defense gets a strictly defined amount of material resources for construction. It has its own reinforced concrete works and timber-processing factories, but we have no possibility to have cement industry of our own, of course. We have to get cement from the State Planning Committee, but these resources are being limited.

[Kireyev] That is what I am saying, too: Under no circumstances must the Ministry of Defense become a state within a state, which it is now, to a certain degree.

[Akhromeyev] I cannot agree with your point that we are a state within a state. This is a political concept, what you are saying, and this statement is a very dangerous one. I disagree with this.

[Kireyev] Now our press has even started using the term "military-industrial complex" as applicable to the Soviet Union, something that astonished me greatly, because we usually understand the military-industrial complex as quite a specific class structure, so to speak, characteristic of capitalist society.

[Akhromeyev] Is it a fact that now we approach all phenomena with class criteria? We have many approaches now that are far removed from scientific ones.

[Kireyev] Sergey Fedorovich, I think that all this happens, on the whole, because the level of glasnost in our military sphere is insufficient and, in my view, it is considerably lagging behind the level of glasnost that exists in society in general.

[Akhromeyev] This is what I would like to say on this. Yes, a problem has remained with us, which you have spoken of, that the Soviet Union, or rather, people do not believe that the Soviet Armed Forces can defend them. I would like us to discuss this matter.

[Lyubimov] OK, we will make a note of it.

[Akhromeyev] To discuss it.

[Lyubimov] You said that you think that the majority....

[Akhromeyev, interrupting] Not just me. I would like to say where this has come from. Now I would ask you to repeat this question....

[Kireyev] About our glasnost....

[Akhromeyev] Yes, well, in the first place, in order to discuss this matter, I have to say that the level of glasnost in an area concerning the Armed Forces cannot be the same as, say, in an area concerning the State Committee on Television and Radio.

[Lyubimov] Why? Apart from industrial secrets....

[Akhromeyev] No, the Armed Forces have a lot of military secrets. There are matters relating to the planning and use of Armed Forces for repulsing aggression. There are matters relating to the management of the Armed Forces, there are matters relating to scientific research work....

[Lyubimov] No one's going to argue with this, of course.

[Akhromeyev] Well, exactly. But this is another matter. Matters relating to the political and moral condition, the strengthening of military discipline, material arrangements—these matters should be open. Of course, regarding the fact that there are certain problems which should be closed, and there are certain problems which we have to open up, the very process of glasnost develops slowly, I agree with you. But that does not mean that someone is throttling it and hampering it. I would not say that. There are objective difficulties.

[Zakharov] If, say, a war begins, according to the Rogers Doctrine—yes, the third world war, using conventional weapons—where is the guarantee that someone will not use a nuclear charge or....

[Akhromeyev interrupts] No, I think that in present conditions not only nuclear war but also a so-called war using conventional systems in Europe is impossible. It no longer exists as such. There are 256 nuclear power stations in Europe. What did the accident at Chernobyl alone yield? And if a war breaks out, then these power stations will start to explode. There are thousands of factories in Europe with dangerous chemical facilities. All of this will go up in the air. Such a war is impossible. But it is another matter—and one of you raised the matter—that there may be a conflict unleashed, not tomorrow perhaps, or some situation which might lead to this. The people to whom the homeland's defense capacity is entrusted cannot base their views just on wishes and thoughts: They have to base their views on the realities of modern life, the realities of the situation that is taking shape. For this reason I think that such a war is impossible, and I even believe that no one wants it, but that does not mean that the possibility of it coming about is totally excluded.

[Kireyev] So let's make sure that it does not come about. That is precisely what we are striving for.

[Lyubimov] Aleksey, what is your point of view on this? Are any deviations, so to speak, potential options possible within this general relaxation which would make this road easier, shorten it, and establish a stronger basis for mutual confidence?

[Kireyev] You know, from my point of view one of the paradoxes here consists in the fact that nuclear weapons are comparatively cheap weapons. By comparison with conventional assets, conventional arms, nuclear weapons cost a lot less. The Americans, for instance, spend no more than 20 percent on nuclear weapons; the rest goes on conventional weapons. This may sound a bit blasphemous but a nuclear warhead costing a mere $1 million—again according to U.S. estimates—can cause material damage worth $1 billion. There is no more

efficient weapon from an economic point of view. Perhaps that is one of the reasons that, all in all, the West continues to cling to nuclear weapons as a means of deterrence.

It goes without saying that from my point of view the program of destroying nuclear weapons by the end of this century is our principal direction, but speaking frankly, I, as a scientist, somewhat doubt that its implementation is realistic. It lays down very serious, very big steps which are not possible without deep and thorough study, including the economic aspects. You can well imagine that if an agreement is reached on 50 percent cuts in strategic offensive weapons—it now appears that the road toward that is open, we have to some extent removed the SDI issue from the foreground, as one U.S. magazine put it, Eduard Shevardnadze laid the SDI to rest with a smile during his meeting with U.S. State Secretary Baker—and so if strategic nuclear weapons are cut back, that means several thousands of various weapons, it means enormous amounts of money spent on these weapons and finally it means enormous amounts of money that we shall have to pay in order to destroy these weapons. The manner in which we now destroy these weapons, using the INF agreement as the example, does not suit me personally at all. We burn them, blow them up, cut them up....

[Zakharov interrupts] Chop them up.

[Kireyev]...Chop them up.

[Akhromeyev] This is an important issue and by no means an easy one, not at all easy. Incidentally, we've been facing it since before 1988. In fact, we started working on this problem in 1986 and began its practical implementation in 1987. We did not announce it but we had been doing this. After all, it does not mean merely having to end the production of weapons. That is fine and relatively straightforward. But afterwards, on the same production lines you have to launch other, perhaps less complex but sufficiently advanced....

[Lyubimov interrupts] I think that that is the most critical issue.

[Akhromeyev] All this requires a lot of money. We must not make the people who work there unemployed. The process should go ahead in a planned and consistent manner, but comapartively quickly, so that they provide goods for our national economy and our people.

[Kireyev] The impression you get from analysing Soviet press material devoted to conversion issues—and we get quite a lot of it these days—is that we are ruining ouselves through this very conversion. Unfortunately, right now we interpret conversion as the defense sectors assisting the civilian sectors. We have to get machine manufacture for the light and food industries up to scratch. So they set the appropriate defense sectors the task of making things that are completely unnatural for them. For instance, Minaviaprom [Aviation Industry Ministry]—incidentally, from outside, apparently a civilian ministry, but according to our data it turns out that Minaviaprom's share of civilian production is a mere 36 percent, the rest is military production. What's it going to be making? Equipment for packaging fruit and vegetable products, starch and treacle products, pasta products, and so on and so forth. Why, in fact, should Minaviaprom be involved in this? Have we already resolved all our problems in aircraft manufacture?

[Lyubimov] Aeroflot never provides enough flights.

[Kireyev] Here, we never have enough flights.

[Akhromeyev] You haven't told the whole story, Aleksey Pavlovich. It is at the same time going to increase the production of the Il-96-300 planes, the TU-204 planes, the Il-114 planes; it is going to increase the production of planes for civil aviation. But side-by-side it is also going to produce all the things you mentioned.

[Kireyev] With your permission, I will read you a quote which to my mind is very characteristic. Ivanov, chief designer of the Moscow Mil Helicopter Works, says: We are now manufacturing sanders, paint spray guns; we are about to start producing jam-making equipment, and so on. I do not deny that we need all this, but is it really worth using electronics to hammer in nails? If interest in exports was created we would be able to sell our helicopters even in the world markets.

You see, here we are getting distortions and not the least reason for this is that right up to this very day we have no state plan for conversion. How can you transfer such enormous production forces without a state plan? They are only proposing to draw one up by the end of the year, while conversion, according to you, has been going on since 1986. In the United States, where there's still no question, so to speak, of conversion in practice, for the last 25 years, I think, they have been debating a law on conversion, that is, they want to provide a basis for this problem at the state level, at the legislative level. I think that in this field we are disastrously lagging behind and the most important thing is that not a single deputy at the session—I've been following it closely, and perhaps other things take precedence—has raised this issue.

[Akhromeyev] Well, but in that case you shouldn't have invited only me to come along, because I am not a conversion specialist and I am not a specialist in transferring defense industry sectors to civilian production.

[Lyubimov] In that case we'll close this subject.

[Akhromeyev] I would now like to return to that very sore and critical issue—for me personnaly and for the whole of the armed forces—when you said that, anyway, a significant party of the Soviet people do not believe or doubt that the armed forces of the Soviet Union can defend them if necessary. Well, I think that is incorrect. Our armed forces are now in such a condition that they are capable of it. Incidentally, I would like to tell you, first of all, that I am expressing my own personal view.

But I think, I think that majority of servicemen would agree with me, with what I am saying right now.

[Lyubimov] That's very valuable.

[Akhromeyev] Second, I am in no way advocating that the Armed Forces should not be criticized. I have been a communist, by the way, since 1942 and have sufficient party-mindedness, and have had all my life, to have the appropriate attitude to criticism. Although none of us like it, we understand that it is necessary for the progress and development of society, and in this case, for the development of the Armed Forces.

But there is criticism and criticism. I am not against criticism but I am against insults. I am against unfounded attacks on the Armed Forces and it is particularly impermissible when these insults are inflicted against the Armed Forces. Here, take a look. Issue no. 31 of the OGONEK magazine says bluntly that a military coup is possible in the Soviet Union. What does a military coup mean? It means that an overthrow of the existing state system, the existing social system is possible by the Armed Forces, since it is a military coup.

[Lyubimov] Sergey Fedorovich, a point of view....

[Akhromeyev interrupts] Hang on, just a minute. I am not saying that this is not a point of view. It is a point of view but, it is a point of view which insults the Armed Forces. Who carries out a coup? Presumably the leaders. So I, being a self-critical man, think in the first instance that this refers to me and others like me. But what grounds are there for this. You are saying a point of view, but you need grounds for a point of view.

[Lyubimov] All right, but on the other hand....

[Akhromeyev interrupts] Where in the history of our country has there ever been anything of that kind or like it? Indeed, in 1937 Tukhachevskiy, Yakir, Uborevich, Kork, and others were accused of preparing a military coup and they were shot. So what are the people who say this implying?

[Lyubimov] All right, but the removal of Beriya was after all backed up by the military.

[Zakharov] Sergey Fedorovich....

[Akhromeyev] Hang on a minute. The removal of Beriya was carried out on a decision of the political leadership. The military acted the way they did because that was what they were ordered to do.

[Akhromeyev] But could you tell me what are the grounds for these kind of accusations?

[Zakharov] Just a moment, Sergey Fedorovich....

[Lyubimov interrupting] I do not want to defend the OGONEK magazine, that is not the point....

[Zakharov interrupting] No, no, no. There is a science called political science. The Americans, who also presumably do not envision the possibility of a military coup, published a book entitled "Seven Days in May"....

[Akhromeyev interrupting] I have read it.

[Zakharov] ...which considers such a possibility. You see, they reckon with such options, and common sense of political culture suggests that such situations should be reckoned with, without inflicting insults on anyone.

[Akhromeyev] Excuse me, but this book is fiction, whereas what we are referring to is not fiction....

[Zakharov interrupting] But you can also get learned articles....

[Akhromeyev interrupting] Hang on, in this instance the specific situation which the Soviet Union is living through is analyzed and they say that a military coup can be expected from the Armed Forces. I regard that as an insult. You may regard, you may have a different view, but this is my view and I am expressing it.

Second, in another issue, No 25, here is what it says in OGONEK: The army is swathed in a smokescreen of secrecy. Apparently this is a convenient screen for keeping from outsiders' eyes the shortcomings and ailments of the Armed Forces.

Who, I mean, this is a direct accusation against the leadership of the Armed Forces, because the subject is the Armed Forces. I think this is totally groundless.

[Lyubimov] Sergey Fedorovich....

[Akhromeyev, interrupting] Hold on. Fine. This is completely groundless.

Finally the third point: There are attacks on the political bodies; it is being said that the political bodies are not necessary. Incidentally, this very same magazine, OGONEK, actively advocates this idea, but if we stop and think: What are the political bodies in the armed forces?; they are CPSU representatives in the armed forces. Here, we have the CPSU rules, which define the place of political bodies in the armed forces, and it clearly says here that the leadership of party work in the armed forces is effected by the CPSU Central Committee through the political bodies. That means that the people who are talking about this simply are attacking the political bodies in parallel with attacking the CPSU. I think these attacks are groundless.

[Zakharov] Sergey Fedorovich, what happens if we get two parties? Would we have two systems of political bodies?

[Akhromeyev] You see, first of all, you would have to have the two parties. Then you first would have to change the political system, and then start talking about it.

[Zakharov] Of course.

[Lyubimov] I agree, that is a different issue.

[Akhromeyev] However, we now have a poltiical system that is consolidated in the Constitution. It says in the Constitution that the CPSU is a leading force of our society, and on the basis of the constitution, the CPSU has deployed political bodies in the armed forces. So on what grounds are these being attacked? I have a different view, however, that the ones who are attacking are those who are against a socialist system in our country; they are the ones who are attacking.

[Zakharov] Sergey Fedorovich, let us return to the issue of openness. Here is an example: I am in Belgium and I walk into a children's toy shop. They have there a model of the U.S. B-2 Stealth bomber; next to it there is a MiG-29, a MiG-31, an Su-27, a Tu-160. Right next to that is a T-80, the tank they call the FST, and whatever else you like. They have toys of the latest types of military hardware: Soviet, U.S., any kind you like. Why are the Americans not afraid to make information about these things available?

[Akhromeyev] You and I want to cover in 4 years the distance it took those states many decades to cover. We now are moving swiftly toward glasnost, toward democracy; we are opening up one area after another. So what do you want. Do you want us to cover in 4 years the distance it took them decades to cover? We now are opening up a great deal: we are bringing a great deal into the open. Our discussion of today would have been impossible 3 years ago. Now it is possible and discussions that are more, well, more frank on military issues also are possible. So, comrades, it is simply that we also need time to be able to digest all this. You can see yourselves how we, our society, already has started to choke. Now we already need, as you see, we are already taking urgent, extraordinary measures so that the national economy can function normally.

[Lyubimov] But secrecy presumably is not relevant to this?

[Akhromeyev] No, everything is relevant to it. I am not saying secrecy is relevant, but democracy and glasnost are relevant.

[Akhromeyev] You are raising the issue of greater democratization in the army. I also agree that we need it. But at the same time the army needs sole commanders. Armed forces cannot exist without sole commanders. So how over a short period of time do we combine the greater glasnost, democracy, and the sole responsibility of commanders? We have to learn this.

[Lyubimov] It is a sore issue.

[Akhromeyev] You see, we can't, we could otherwise end up with the armed forces falling apart.

[Zakhrov] We are by no means calling for that.

[Akhromeyev] I am not saying you are. But we could end up with the kind of objective reality in which this could take place. Consequently we need some kind of gradual and planned approach for introducing glasnost in the life of society and in the life of the army.

[Kireyev] It seems to me that if we are claiming greater glasnost, and that indeed is the case, we should either cite sufficiently full data and right away, or not cite them at all. I shall only mention one example in this case. For instance, we have stated for the first time the real figure for the Soviet military budget—in the entire post war period we had indeed never stated this figure—R77.3 billion. But for a scientist, for an analyst, this figure is of almost no value because immediate questions arise. What were the dynamics of the preceeding years? Was this previously greater or smaller? A scientist needs a series of statistics to be able to derive a trend, whereas we get one figure.

A second question arises—what price is this figure expressed in, current or fixed? Do they take account of inflation?

Third question....

[Akromeyev, interrupting and passing Kireyev a sheet of paper] Since you are a scientist, I shall make up this shortcoming straightaway. Here you have expenditures since 1976. It's for you.

[Zakharov] That's an enourmous contribution.

[Kireyev] Thank you very much. Will this be published anywhere?

[Akhromeyev] Hold on. For the time being you study it and then we will come to an arrangement on how you are going to publish it.

[Lyubimov] Can we show this on the television screen?

[Akhromeyev]) No, don't. He's asked for these, let him take it.

[Lyubimov, laughing] There's glasnost for you.

[Kireyev] Well, you see, another question comes up here. I note straight away here from the items that in principle the U.S. military budget has been used as the basis and presumably the expenditure was calculated under the same items. But many items are simply not here. We don't have here—that's the question which arises—does this include the expenditure on maintaining troops abroad? If it does, which item is it included in? The question arises whether....

[Akhromeyev, interrupting] Hold on, but why does such a question arise for you? You have an item on expenditure on the armed forces. It is irrelevant where they are, abroad or on the territory of the Soviet Union.

[Kireyev] It arises because in the U.S. budget this is financed under a separate item. Do you see?

[Akhromeyev] Well, you see, I keep telling you, you are very impatient people.

[Kireyev] That's because we are young.

[Akhromeyev] You are young and you want it all at once on a plate. Just think how we established this budget of R77.3 billion. After all, we did not have it as such. Previously the armed forces were only interested in what they were given for upkeep, in accordance with a government decision. As far as research and development was concerned, that came under the ministries of defense industry sectors. Nor did we pay for series production deliveries. First we had to bring all this together. We did indeed take as our basis the U.S. budget so that we could compare. We collected this, analyzed it, and published it. But this again is not enough for you. So we are now giving you more. Again, it's not enough for you. But you have to understand, even if you are young, that not everything can be done in a day. Moscow was not built in a day. Moreover, you most frequently see someone's malicious intent behind this.

[Zakharov] We don't.

[Akhromeyev] That's not the way, comrades. Everything is being done consistently. I repeat again, we need some time, we need a planned approach, and we need calm.

[Akhromeyev] Even here, we are discussing things, and right at the outset you came out with all these words like 'excessive.' We mustn't, ah, these are issues of tremendous state importance, these are issues which should be examined calmly. Admittedly—I hope you'll excuse me—I myself am not a very calm man....

[Zakharov, interrupts] Not at all, Sergey Fedorovich.

[Akhromeyev]...But I am not very calm in discussions, whereas in analysis I try not (?to rush things).

[Lyubimov] Sergey Fedorovich, this reminds me....

[Akhromeyev interrupting] I hope you'll forgive me, but I am telling you this as an old man and an old Komsomol member.

[Zakharov] We understand.

[Lyubimov] Not at all, I think it's perfectly appropriate.

Sergey Fedorovich, in connection with this, what is your attitude to the committee set up in the Supreme Soviet on issues of defense, on matters of defense and state security? To what extent is this mechanism effective? How good are the specialists there? Can it help the army or in any way tackle problems connected with the defense sector?

[Akhromeyev] Well, what sort of attitude can I have toward it if I am its member? The very fact that I am a member of that committee places on me every obligation, moral and that of a deputy, to ensure that it functions normally. But, comrades, for it to function normally, so that it can analyse the budget and can approach it critically, the people of course have to be trained for it.

[Lyubimov] Yes, that was precisely my point.

[Akhromeyev] Right now the committee is not only examining the budget but it is learning. It gets lectures, hears military leaders, leaders of the defense industry sectors, scientists. It visits the troops. That is, the committee is learning. The members of the committee are aware of their responsibility. But for them to become true parliamentarians with an inclination toward matters military obviously needs time, at least several months.

[Lyubimov] I would like to thank you for coming to our studio, and I hope that your experience and opportunity to work on this committee for defense and state security matters, as well as the abilities of civilian scientists who are trying to elucidate some issues connected with the armed forces, will together help our armed forces, will help our country to maintain the armed forces at a sufficient defense capability level, and will help us all to survive on this planet, so to speak. I would like to thank you once again, many thanks for your contribution to glasnost on issues of the army and military organizational development.

Correction to Akhromeyev on Military Issues

LD1210195389

The preceding item, "Akhromeyev Discussses Military Issues," which is a later and fuller broadcast of the Moscow TV item entitled "Discussion on Military Secrecy, Glasnost" that appeared on pages 90-92 of the 11 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, permits the following clarifications on the earlier item:

page 90, column two, subslug should read: ["Studio discussion with Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Federovich Akhromeyev and Aleksey Kireyev, candidate of economic sciences, and presenters Dmitriy Zakharov and Aleksandr Lyubimov; from the "View" program];

page 91, column one, paragraph one, make sentence one read: [Text] [Zakharov] Sergey Federovich, here... (supplying name of presenter);

page 91, column one, paragraph four, make only sentence read: [Lyubimov] But secrecy probably... (supplying name of presenter);

page 91, column one, paragraph six, make only sentence read: [Lyubimov] I suggest we... (supplying name of presenter);

page 91, column two, paragraph two, make only sentence read: [Zakharov] That is an... (supplying name of presenter);

page 91, column two, paragraph five, make only sentence read: [Lyubimov] Shall we show... (supplying name of presenter);

page 91, column two, last paragraph, make sentence one read: [Lyubimov] Sergey Federovich, in... (supplying name of presenter);

page 92, column two, paragraph two, make sentence can read: [Lyubimov] Thank you for... (supplying name of presenter).

Yazov Addresses Army Ideological Conference

LD1110202189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] The all-Army conference of ideological workers continued in Moscow today. Those taking part in it were addressed by Army General Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

He said in particular that the democratization of army life is creating real preconditions for the human factor to start operating vigorously, without which the realization of quality parameters as regards equipment, military science and the composition of the Armed Forces is impossible. In resolving this problem it is difficult to overestimate the role of ideological workers. They themselves must, above all, have a profound understanding of the processes of the democratization of the Armed Forces and pass on this knowledge to commanders, political workers, and the entire personnel of the Army and Navy.